THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION

Volume XIII JUNE, 1927 Number 3

JOHN GALSWORTHY: THE ARTIST AS PROPAGANDIST

V. E. SIMRELL
Kalamazoo College

THE Play's the thing wherein to catch the conscience of an audience. That, inadequately but quite accurately, describes Galsworthy's practice as dramatic artist and propagandist.

It is usually unwise, as Mr. Galsworthy himself says, to "put into words what lies at the back of endeavor" but the impulse to reveal responds to the curiosity to discover those subjective promptings of art. And so long as critics exist who distort the proportions of what lies at the back of endeavor and thrust what the artist has repressed into the light of what he has sought to express, there is need of considering just how far our dramatist or novelist *is* really a speech-maker in disguise. It is better to seek his convictions out of his own mouth than to have them thrust upon us by others.

Mr. Archibald Henderson, for instance, in his new edition of *European Dramatists*, tells us that Galsworthy is "posing groups of lay figures, not projecting scenes of human life by possible people in possible situations, through the colored lens of art." We wonder if he is not too good a propagandist to attempt to convince by means of "lay figures," by impossible people in impossible situations. And Dr. Phelps writes of him, "When he wakes up in the morning in pleasant surroundings and sits down to an excellent breakfast, his pleasure in it is spoiled by the fact that so many persons of equally estimable character are condemned to hardship." We wonder, again, if Mr. Galsworthy is not too thoroughly the artist to let his propaganda spoil either his breakfast or his play.

Under the evil influence of H. G. Wells and the World War we have developed a distorted notion of propaganda. The propagandist is not rightly opposed to the artist. Bias is as foreign, balance as essential to one as to the other. An exaggerated opinion has as little power to persuade the mind as a disproportioned statue has to attract the eye. Our judgment is not—should not be, at least—less discriminating than our senses. Taste is the arbiter of both. "Realist-Romanticist! Enlightment-Delight! That is the true apposition. To make a revelation—to tell a fairy tale." That is Mr. Galsworthy's own division of motives, and he has chosen for himself that of enlightenment and revelation.

Selecting as his problems the most serious conundrums of our social encyclopedia of puzzles, he has yet rarely offered a solution. Seeking to spread his principles of understanding, justice, and sympathy, he has yet made no effort to proselyte. "It is not the artist's business to preach. Admitted! His business is to portray—." But the artist as propagandist does not seek to right a social wrong unless it is a wrong, and then he knows that society's understanding of the wrong is the only power to effect a permanent remedy. Preaching may appeal to the impulses; it takes portrayal to reach the understanding. It has been well said that in Galsworthy's plays the audience is the Villain, but it is not because he doubts our impulses. He is simply thoroughly convinced of our lack of understanding. Social propaganda, to be effective, must make us see social wrong; portrayal then is its effective method. Enlightenment! Revelation! To Galsworthy an impulse is neither good nor bad; it is enlightened or unenlightened.

Yet, Mr. Galsworthy writes, "A man could not write anything sincere with the elevation of the Public as incentive. —He can only express himself sincerely *by not considering the Public at all.* — To please your best self is the only way of being sincere." But in the next paragraph he writes, "And yet, with each sincere thing made—even if only fit for reposing in a drawer—its maker is stronger, and will some day make that which need not lie covered away, but reach out from him to other man."[1] It is only by forgetting the Public—that is, our conglomeration of individual men —that an artist may reconcile and identify himself with universal

[1] From *The New Spirit in the Drama*, a very significant essay by Mr. Galsworthy in the Living Age, 1913.

man. It is only through contact with such art that the Public can be reconciled and identified with universal man. And it is only by reconciling and identifying the Public with universal man that the artist as propagandist can promote understanding and social progress.

It's a difficult dilemma that the dramatist faces: that of losing his public for the sake of finding it. Mankind like the individual has a higher self and a lower; the higher self is Man the universal, the lower is the Public. The artist may care only for the former, the propagandist only for the latter; the artist as propagandist must care for both. He cannot afford to lose his own soul in winning the world; yet he must expand in order to survive. "Not till the heavens fall will the majority of the Public demand sincerity," writes Mr. Galsworthy; yet he goes on with his struggle to reconcile the Public with Man the universal; it is part of his sincerity, his fidelity to himself, to carry on the struggle. "If we are of the crew who cannot see any good in a fight unless we know it is going to end in victory, if we expect the millenium with every spring—we shall advance nothing."

II

Now pity and fear have been the traditional means of the dramatist seeking to purge audiences of their extravagances of prejudice and passion. Pity and fear, for the Greeks, may have been an adequate catharsis of evil humors but our civilization has too long developed its immunity to their anti-toxic power. The wise physician then prescribes a change of medicine; the wisest of our contemporaries in the theatre prescribes Understanding. The method meets obvious difficulties. Professor Phelps says of Galsworthy in this regard: "He aims directly at the intelligence of the spectators, a faint and difficult target." It depends, we imagine, on the spectators; Galsworthy has not always failed to find his target.

The propagandist who appeals to intelligence must be on common ground with the intelligent. One of the ancient and eternal watchwords of the intelligent is "Nothing in excess." Even so eminent a critic as Clayton Hamilton censures Galsworthy for adopting this sanest of principles: "He seems to know nothing," writes Mr. Hamilton, "Or to care nothing about the psychology of theatre audiences." Yes, *but,* Mr. Hamilton, don't you see that

Mr. Galsworthy as a propagandist is seeking to clean up some of the very messy conditions in present society, that he believes the remedy of those conditions is Understanding, and that to appeal to Understanding he must himself obey the laws of intelligence rather than the behavioristic psychology of mobs?

Here is his creed: "Nothing because it pays. Nothing because it makes a sensation. No situations faked. No characters falsified. No fireworks. Only something imagined and put down in a passion of sincerity." Sincerity is good art, regardless of the majority of the public; it is also good propaganda, for it is still true that the persuaded persuade.

There is a touch of truth, perhaps, in Mr. Hamilton's remark, "Mr. Galsworthy, as a playwright, overacts his underacting. He is too desperately afraid to permit the theatre to become theatrical, even when occasion warrants." The evidence which Mr. Hamilton gives in support of the criticism, however, is no support at all. He says, "Throughout the entire second act of *Justice*, which represents the trial of Falder, the leading actor is forced to sit still in the prisoner's dock and is given nothing to say or do." Mr. Hamilton in another place[2] criticizes Galsworthy for declining to speak in public *ex tempore* and in another boasts of his own "unfettered spontaneity." If this criticism is a sample—and it is—we must say that, either as propaganda or as art, we much prefer Mr. Galsworthy's careful moderation. The statement in regard to *Justice* is flagrantly untrue. Falder holds the stage for six and a half pages as the play is printed. During that time he is in the witness-box instead of the prisoner's dock, telling the court the details of the crime which has brought him there and incidentally showing the audience—not telling it—what a miscarriage of "justice" and act of organized stupidity his legal punishment is to be. His crime has been that of altering a check to secure funds with which to rescue the wife of a brutal husband and elope with her to South America. The defending attorney asks him:

You became devotedly attached to her, however?

Falder. **Yes.**

The Judge interrupts:

Though you knew she was a married woman?

Falder. **I couldn't help it, your lordship.**

[2] All three of these quotations are from Mr. Hamilton's *Conversations on Contemporary Drama.*

The examination goes on; I quote another speech of Falder's from the witness-box (not his longest): He is describing the morning of the crime:

> I was having my breakfast when she came. Her dress was all torn, and she was gasping and couldn't seem to get her breath at all; there were the marks of his fingers round her throat; her arm was bruised, and the blood had got into her eyes dreadfully. It frightened me, and then when she told me, I felt—I felt—well—it was too much for me! *(Hardening suddenly)* If you'd seen it, having the feelings for her that I had, you'd have felt the same, I know.

And then the scene of "Justice" goes on to its end, the sentence of three years' penal servitude. It's all a demonstration (not an indictment, for Galsworthy's method is always that of portrayal) of society's "keen eye for molehills, and none at all for mountains." And that demonstration centers in Falder's testimony from the witness-box—where Mr. Hamilton says he is not. It is a very moderate, unextravagant demonstration, a perfect example of Galsworthy's method of emphasis by understatement, but also a very striking and adequate demonstration—not at all the overacting of underacting.

The only play, which, as I see it, furnishes any justification of the criticism is *The Mob*. The "Aftermath," which concludes the play, presents only the statue of Stephen Moore, who, just before the last curtain has fallen, has been killed by a mob for opposing his country in an imperialistic war. The inscription around the pedestal tells the whole story: Erected—To the Memory-of-STEPHEN MORE—"Faithful to his ideal." This may be overacting underacting but it's rather impressive at that. I think it's preferable, for instance, to the "Epilogue" of Shaw's *Saint Joan* which is planned for a similar effect. At any rate, it is high praise and just praise to say of Galsworthy that although at times his effects may suffer from too little talking, they never suffer from too much. Galsworthy's style and some of Galsworthy critics are both best characterized by Joseph Conrad when he writes, "Its sustained harmony is never interrupted by those bursts of cymbals and fifes which some deaf people acclaim for brilliance."

To say that Mr. Galsworthy appeals to intelligence and understanding is not to say that his plays are exclusively intellectual or that his propaganda is all serious ratiocination. His lightness of

touch, his "ironic insight" of which Conrad speaks, his unaffected good humor arouse the will to believe and help beyond measure the intellectual appeal of his moderation and understatement. Seriousness is not at all a necessary symptom of intelligence. It is often the refuge—sometimes the camouflage merely—of tired minds. Irony, wit, laughter: these are not serious, as we ordinarily conceive of seriousness. But they demand a fitness of mind, an activity of one's emotional and intellectual forces which seriousness, the far more pedestrian mood, may and often does do without.

They are good medicine for the physician as well as for the patient. The artist as propagandist needs courage, limitless courage, to carry on, and as Farrand, in Galsworthy's *The Pigeon,* remarks, "There is nothing that gives more courage than to see the irony of things." And yet Professor Phelps unaccountably says of Galsworthy, "—the deserts of his tragedies have no springs of laughter." Why! None of his tragedies is more poignantly tragic than *Justice,* and in that splendid trial scene which I have already mentioned the Judge himself has to smile when the old clerk, Cokeson, gives his testimony. It is as true of Galsworthy's style, the "flavor" of his plays, as it is of the characters, that irony and pathos, humor and tragedy are made to harmonize.

Galsworthy, himself, in writing of such drama as his own, has said: "Now it has been the fashion to dub this 'new' drama the 'serious' drama; the label is deliberately unfortunate, and not particularly true. If Rabelais or Robert Burns appeared again in mortal form and took to writing plays, they would be "new" dramatists with a vengeance—as new as ever Ibsen was; and assuredly they would be sincere; but could they be called 'serious'? Can we call Synge, or St. John Hankin, or Mr. Shaw, or Mr. Barrie serious? Hardly! Yet they are all of this new movement because they are sincere. The word serious, in fact, has too narrow a significance, and admits a deal of pompous stuff that is not sincere. While the word sincere, though it certainly does not characterize all that is popularly included under the term 'new drama,' as certainly does characterize (if taken in its true sense of fidelity to self), all that is really new in it and excludes no mood, no temperament, no form of expression that can pass the test of ringing true."

Mr. Galsworthy, as artist and as propagandist, is neither

Sophist nor dilettante. Rather than reveal a problem in order to write a play, he writes a play in order to reveal a problem. If the problem is real and important—as all of Galsworthy's problems are—it demands a remedy which will be real and potent. Short-cut remedies are good only for superficial diseases. The diseases of society are not superficial, and the remedy they demand is the slow, difficult, but ultimately sure remedy of Understanding. To justify that method the propagandist must obey its principles in his own work. Most vital of all, and involving all other principles, is that which Galsworthy better than any other contemporary embodies, the principle of proportion: proportion in the original conception of the problem, proportion in its portrayal, proportion in the moods which color the portrayal. It is this principle which makes Mr. Galsworthy's art and his propaganda "ring true."

III

Mr. Galsworthy states his essential theory of artistic propaganda when he writes, "Every grouping of life and character has its inherent moral; and the business of the dramatist is to so pose the group as to bring that moral poignantly to the light of day." Mr. Galsworthy's "morals," however, are not of the ill-proportioned type of, say, "The early bird catches the first worm." He takes the worm into equal consideration with the bird. Nor does he think it necessary, nor indeed, as I have said before, even permissible, to magnify the moral for the sake of those who can not see clearly in plain daylight. In a private letter, after explaining the "point" of *The Pigeon*, he writes, "I hope this is sufficiently obscure!"

From these twin causes of fairness and reserve results the common misconception that Galsworthy is inconclusive. As Mr. Hamilton expresses it, "If you intend to interest a theatre audience in a dramatic struggle, you cannot be non-partisan. You must take sides, and you must permit the audience to take sides."

The criticism is levelled particularly at *Strife*, the play wherein Capital and Labor fight to a very costly draw. Mr. Hamilton says, "—why shouldn't he have written two different plays,—one on one side and one on the other?—Both plays might have been good plays; and in that event, both plays would have been successful. The public would have had a good time rooting for the laborers one season and rooting for the capitalists the next." And then he says, "But imagine being taken to a football game between

two fresh-water colleges that you have never heard of and watching it fought out to a final score of nothing to nothing! Yet that is the way in which Mr. Galsworthy plans a dramatic entertainment."

The point is that in *Strife* Galsworthy's "case" is not between Capital and Labor at all; it is between understanding and strife, between means and extremes, between uncompromising leaders of factions and their conciliatory followers. The forces arrayed against each other are, then, far from being analagous to "fresh-water colleges" of which we have never heard; they are such universal forces that a more decisive outcome of their conflict would not ring true, any more than we would credit a report of a 100-0 score in an Army-Navy football game.

The result is decisive enough as it is. Roberts, the labor leader, whose own wife dies of starvation in the conflict, expresses the spirit of the irreconcilables when he says, "If I saw Mr. Anthony going to die, and I could save him by lifting my hand, I would not lift the little finger of it." And Anthony, leader of the irreconcilables of capital, tells his directors, "There is only one way of treating 'men'—*with the iron hand.*" Old Thomas, the laborer, on the other hand, says, "Shame on your strife." And Edgar, Anthony's own son, reminds his father that "There is such a thing as Mercy." Robert and Anthony merge into one dramatic personality, whose tragic flaw, in Shakespearian terms, is strife. And the result? The followers desert their leaders and effect a compromise. The cost?

> *Harness.* "A woman dead; and the two best men both broken!"
>
> *Tench.* (Staring at him—suddenly excited). D'you know, sir—these terms, they're the *very same* we drew up together, you and I, and put to both sides before the fight began? All this—all this—and—and what for?
>
> *Harness.* (In a slow grim voice). That's where the fun comes in!

These are the concluding lines of the play—the final score of the game. Does it seem necessary to make the "moral," that concession is the better part of conflict, any plainer? Professor Phelps writes, "Humanity however will learn little either from this play or from the struggle it represents, for men (and women too) have such an intense love of war that nothing can keep them out of it." But men (and women too) do not like war nearly so much as they like victory. What Galsworthy insists on is that it is very possible to have either one without the other and very difficult to have

both. And after all, the best propaganda against strife is not an emotional appeal to our partisanship but a portrayal of strife's essential futility. As Edgar Anthony says, "There's nothing wrong with our *humanity*. It's our imaginations, Mr. Scantlebury."

Mr. Galsworthy's most specific propaganda has been directed against materialism, the Forsytean love of property, and in behalf of property's two chief enemies: women and criminals. Women have refused to be property; criminals have refused to respect property. Society has consequently been unjustly and unreasonably cruel to both. Prejudice—the strongest argument of a Forsytean society—has deprived woman of her rights and criminals of their opportunity to regain their rights once lost. Society, with the one, has substituted Property for Beauty and Passion; with the other, Punishment for Reformation. In these specific social wrongs, as in such a general wrong as profitless strife, Galsworthy insists that our imaginations are to blame. "Nobody wishes you harm," says Falder, "but they down you all the same." Prejudice has blinded good impulses and resulted in destruction or cruelty even when no harm was intended. "There is in the air," Mr. Galsworthy writes, "a revolt against prejudice, and a feeling that things must be retested."

The wrong which the prejudice of materialistic society has inflicted on woman is most fully treated in Galsworthy's novels, but the theme runs also through most of his plays. *The Silver Box* shows an innocent woman's suffering when she is caught between her husband's illegal acquisition of property and the law's principle that he who has property may take more and be excused but he who has none and tries to take some shall lose what he has and his liberty into the bargain. Jones goes to jail for stealing, while young Barthwick, son of John Barthwick, M. P., goes unpunished. Mrs. Jones is the real sufferer, but society's law of property gives her no consideration whatever. So in *Justice* Ruth Honeywill gets no protection from a husband who maltreats her, but her would-be rescuer goes to prison for altering a check. In *Strife* a woman, Mrs. Roberts, is the victim of man's struggle for property; in *The Skin Game* a woman is sacrificed by another woman for the sake of property. *The Fugitive* is a justification of woman's right even to sell her body to save her soul from becoming property.

Mr. Galsworthy has also written a number of miscellaneous

papers in behalf of woman's struggle to free herself from man's possession. Their general argument is epitomized in this single sentence from an essay in the *Nation*: "In an age when spirituality has ever a more desperate struggle to maintain hold at all against the inroads of materialism, any increase of bitterness in the national life, and loss of gentleness, aspiration, and mutual trust between the sexes, however silent, secret, and unmeasurable, is a very serious thing." Time and again he has shown that the only way to prevent the loss of gentleness and mutual trust between the sexes is for society to discard entirely its prejudice in favor of man's vested rights in womanhood. Unless that prejudice is freely discarded, "Beauty and Passion come stealing in, filching security from beneath our noses." Whose then the blame but man's?

As man's right to possess is limited, so is his right to punish. "Justice was known by the ancients to be blind; by ourselves is admitted blind; will be acclaimed blind by the tongues of our descendants. —From this general blindness, it follows that punishment is almost always out of proportion." Justice is blind and punishment disproportionate when a criminal like Falder, in *Justice,* who "never wanted to do wrong," is sent to three years' penal servitude. Justice is blind whenever it sends a first offender to prison. "To send him there," Mr. Galsworthy writes, "is fatal, hopeless, uneconomic, unscientific." Justice is blind when it insists on utilizing as a means of punishment closed-cell confinement, "an artificial state of existence, absolutely opposed to that which nature points out as the condition of mental, moral, and physical health." Justice is cruelly blind when its prejudice blinds it to the fact that "Reformation does not come from beating on the prisoner's fibre with the dull mallet of suffering." Mr. Galsworthy is at his best both as artist and as propagandist when he portrays in *Justice* these principles, here[3] argumentatively advanced.

IV

Specific problems, however, are not Mr. Galsworthy's special object as propagandist, even though as artist he is always careful to individualize his characters and his situations. "A good plot," he writes, "is that sure edifice which rises out of the inter-play of circumstances on temperament, or of temperament on circum-

[3] The preceding quotations are from Mr. Galsworthy's essay, The Spirit of Punishment, published in *A Sheaf.*

stances, within the enclosing atmosphere of an idea." So far as circumstances and temperament are concerned, Galsworthy's art is always specific; but the "enclosing atmosphere of an idea" is not robbed of its essential nature in order to tie it to any specific remedy for the problem presented. In the broadest significance of the word Galsworthy's propaganda is constructive. It is hygienic rather than antidotal. His program, as I have said before, is to propagate Understanding rather than to advertise panaceas.

It is partly because the problems that he presents are too universal for antidotal treatment. It is partly because the fault is not so much in the organs of our social system as in the tone of the whole organism. It is because we need hygienic, enlightened, habits of thought rather than a transplanting of impulses. "Prejudices—or are they loyalties—I don't know—criss-cross, we all cut each other's throats from the best of motives," says Margaret in *Loyalties*. If we were to attempt to remedy the social faults which concern Mr. Galsworthy most by any quick-acting, antidotal methods, we'd have to do with most of our social institutions and traditions what Little Anne in *Foundations* proposes to do with houses: "Let's all blow up our own; then we can start fair." Of course even then there would be no assurance that the reconstructed society would be an improvement upon the present; and such a program would hardly appear any more feasible than that of the propagation of Understanding. Given "the best of motives" to start with, it seems reasonable to hope that we may attain sufficient understanding to direct them in sympathetic channels instead of criss-crossing them to cut one another's throats.

To the artist as propagandist the play *is* the thing wherein to catch the conscience of his audience, but it must also impel that conscience toward the artist's ultimate goal. It would be much easier for Mr. Galsworthy to catch the conscience of the average theatre audience if his ultimate concern were not that of Understanding, of Universal sympathy and harmony. With that as his ultimate goal he can hardly be expected to resort to Jonathan Edwards' methods of persuasion, whatever advantages of force and expediency they might offer. He has written, "The Will to Power and the Will to Love have been held up, in turn, as the animating principles of the Universe; but these are, rather, correlative half-truths, whose rivalry is surely stilled and reconciled in a

yet higher principle, the Will to Harmony, to Balance, to Equity. —And this slow spiritual shaping toward Equity proceeds in spite of the workings of the twin bodily agents, force and expediency." What price Equity? Why, Equity! The artist, the propagandist, must, in sincerity, show himself obedient to the principle which he advocates. Mr. Galsworthy once wrote of Bernard Shaw: "And as to the form of Mr. Shaw—why! there is none. And yet, what form could so perfectly express Mr. Shaw's glorious crusade against stupidity, his wonderfully sincere and lifelong mood of sticking pins into a pig?" I know of no better way to conclude this paper than to adapt this comment to Mr. Galsworthy as an artist and propagandist: As to the side that Mr. Galsworthy takes—why! he takes none. And yet, what partisanship could so perfectly express Mr. Galsworthy's glorious crusade against partisanship, against prejudice, against misunderstanding?

A STROBOSCOPIC DISC FOR THE STUDY OF VOCAL PITCH

GILES WILKESON GRAY
University of Iowa

A GREAT many of us are interested in the application of objective methods to the study of various phases of speech, both in original research and in the technique of undergraduate teaching. In no aspect of speech education is such objectivity more necessary than in the study of pitch. It is well known that the unaided ear is not always an infallible guide in distinguishing pitch differences or pitch changes. Closely connected with this is the fact that many students seem quite incapable of making fine distinctions in the pitch of their own voices: a high degree of control of inflection and speech melody has not, for some reason, been developed. If, however, to the auditory perception of pitch is added a precise visual perception, it seems quite apparent that much greater reliability may be secured in the determination of these types of variation.

In the present article is described a piece of apparatus which has been constructed for use in the undergraduate laboratory, for the precise, objective study of this particular characteristic of vocal tones, as used in speech. Incidentally, although originally

made for undergraduate experimentation, it is also being used in research.

The principle of stroboscopy, or stroboscopic vision, has been known for a great many years. Various applications have been made in different fields, in the study of known and unknown frequencies. Some thirteen years ago Seashore described the Tonoscope, which operates on this principle, and which makes use of a high degree of selectivity in the visual reading of pitch, both of the voice and of various musical instruments. In describing the construction of this apparatus, he says:

> The stroboscopic screen is formed by mounting a sheet of aluminum in the shape of a drum over a heavy balance wheel. . . . This screen is 50 cm. wide and has a circumference of 242 cm. The balance wheel is heavily mounted on ball-bearings resting on a heavy iron frame. The whole instrument is enclosed in an oak frame with doors on every facet.
>
> The size of the drum is determined by the minimum area for the legible distribution of 18,500 markings, or stroboscopic dots. In the present screen the dots are bored holes, three and one-half mm. in diameter. The inside of the drum being dark, the holes show up clearly as black spots on the light aluminum surface. These holes are spaced with the highest mechanical accuracy and are arranged in 110 parallel rows. . . . One row has 110 dots and the dot frequency in the remaining rows increases by one dot for each row up to and including 219. Thus we get frequencies to correspond to each integral vibration-frequency in an octave of tones, the octave of 110 v. d. to 220 v. d. This is approximately the octave from *A* up to the *a* below middle c.[1]

The motive power of this Tonoscope is a multipolar motor, synchronized with a 10 d. v. tuning fork, so that the drum revolves at a highly uniform rate of speed, one revolution per second.

The success of this device has been proved in the laboratory, and much valuable work has been done with it. The size, however, and the expense of manufacture have prohibited its extensive use in other laboratories which are limited both in space and finances, and to overcome this objection, the writer has devised a simple apparatus which, in the undergraduate speech laboratory, serves every purpose that could be served by the more elaborate outfit.

The essential part of this device consists of a disc, 25 inches

[1] Seashore, C. E.: The Tonoscope. *Psychological Monographs*, Vol. XVI, No. 3, June 1914, pp. 1-12.

in diameter, cut out of ordinary white Bristol Board. Stronger, tougher material could be used, but it should be comparatively light weight, without being too flexible. This disc was centered on a circular dividing machine, for the use of which permission was generously granted by the department of psychology. At a radius of 3.5 inches, a circle was described by punching, with a 1/32 inch punch, a series of 128 holes, equidistantly spaced with the greatest mechanical accuracy of which the circular divider is capable.

The punch was then moved outward a distance of .1 inch, making a radius of 3.6 inches, and a second circle described, containing 130 holes. The third circle, at a radius of 3.7 inches, contained 132 holes; the fourth, at 3.8 inches, 134; the fifth, at 3.9, 136 holes, and so on, the radii increasing by increments of .1 inch, and the number of holes in the successive circles by 2. Sixty-five such circles were punched, the last, or outer, one containing 256 holes, and having a radius of 11.9 inches. The total number of these holes amount to some 12,480.

The result is a series of sixty-five concentric circles of little holes, spaced, on the inner circle, .1718 inch apart, the distance gradually increasing to .292 inch on the outer circle. The graduation in dot-frequency from 128 on the innermost circle to 256 on the outermost corresponds to the octave from C_1 to Middle C, the dot-frequencies being equal to the *even* integral vibration frequencies in this octave.

In order to increase legibility, the white card around these holes was "spotted" with ink, making black spots a little larger than the holes, or approximately 1/16 inch in diameter.

The intention was to use this Disc on a phonograph turntable. But in most cases, the sides of the phonograph cabinet rise slightly above the level of the metal plate, so it became necessary to provide for raising the Disc above the sides of the cabinet. For this purpose a support was constructed. Upon a light wooden disc, about one inch thick and some ten inches in diameter, six arms were fastened with screws, so as to extend radially at angles of approximately 60° with each other, to a total radius of twelve inches. These arms were constructed of light wood, ¼ inch thick, 1 inch wide where they were fastened to the wooden disk, and tapering to about ⅜ inch at the outer end. The purpose of the arms was, of course, to support the outer edge of the cardboard

Disc. Through the centre of the wooden disc which formed the base of the support, a ¼ inch hole was bored, to fit over the turntable post.

The support, with its projecting arms, was then fitted on the turntable of the phonograph, and the cardboard Disc laid over it. With the turntable revolving, the Disc was accurately centered, and then fastened to the wooden support by means of thumbtacks. Over the Disc was placed a scale, with each row or circle indicated by a figure which represented the dot-frequency.

The speed of the turntable was regulated to sixty revolutions per minute, by checking over a period of five minutes. Increasing the length of time for the checking will, of course, increase the accuracy with which the speed can be determined. This gave a Stroboscopic Disc, similar in principle to the Seashore Tonoscope, "homemade," it is true, yet filling satisfactorily every requirement we have made of it up to the present time.

There is no reason why such a device could not be used with the manometric capsule, or with the vacuum tube, as described by Seashore in the article quoted. The most satisfactory arrangement, probably, is to use a phonelescope and a source of light. The phonelescope is an optical device on the principle of the phonodeik, described by Miller.[2] A membrane, vibrating with the frequency of the tone which impinges upon it, actuates a tiny mirror to the surface of the Stroboscopic Disc, and oscillates with every movement of the diaphragm. The phonelescope was placed quite low, about four inches above the plane of the Disc, so that the narrow beam of light, falling at a sharp angle, would cover the entire series of circles. The oscillations of the light beam are parallel to a radius of the Disc, and not to a tangent or a chord. The light was intensified by lenses placed both between the light source and the phonelescope, and between the phonelescope and the Disc. A speaking tube led to the phonelescope.

Regarding this optical device itself, little need be said. It has been used by many experimenters, and its accuracy for the reading of pitch has been demonstrated. The accuracy of the speed of the Disc may require some discussion, for unless the speed is uniform, the Disc itself is of little or no value.

The phonograph has for its motive power a spring motor, the

[2] Miller, D. C.: *Science of Musical Sounds.* Macmillan, 1916.

speed of which is controlled by a very sensitive governor. The speed is, therefore, quite uniform; so much depends on that uniformity in reproducing the ordinary commercial musical record that one might almost take it for granted. Furthermore, Seashore's Pitch Discrimination Test would be valueless if the speed of the phonograph were any less uniform. The smallest pitch difference in this test is .5 d. v. At a frequency of 435 d. v., a variation in the speed of the turntable of .001 revolution per second would result in a variation of .3346 d. v. in the frequency, sufficient to invalidate the entire test. On the other hand, such a minute variation in the speed would cause a displacement of the dots on the Stroboscopic Disc so slight as to be imperceptible. The most it could do would be to produce a very slight fuzziness at the edge of the dots, or a slight backward and forward movement of the dots on the circle which indicated the pitch. The essential stroboscopic effect would still be preserved.

The principle of operation of the apparatus is very simple. Suppose that a tone of 128 d. v. were being sounded into the mouthpiece. The membrane vibrates, and the mirror oscillates, to that frequency. The beam of light flashes back and forth at that same rate. Now the Disc is revolving at a speed of one revolution per second, which means that on the innermost circle, successive dots pass a given point one every 128th of a second. As the beam of light flashes across that point the first dot is there. At the next flash, one 128th of a second later, the next dot has come; by the third flash, another dot has taken the place. The effect, due to retinal lag, is that the row of dots on that circle seems to stand still. It is comparable to the old motion pictures in which we used to see the spokes of automobile wheels stand still, or move backward. Similarly, a tone of a frequency of 150 d. v. would cause the dots on the 150 circle to remain stationary. Any tone of a given frequency, in fact, would cause arrested movement of the dots of the circle whose dot-frequency corresponded to that vibration frequency.

Suppose the frequency of the tone is not known. The Disc is selective. Only that row of dots stands still which corresponds to the unknown frequency. One can, therefore, read visually any pitch that may be intoned into the mouthpiece. Suppose, however, a frequency is given which is an odd number, such as 135, or 177, and therefore has no circle with the dot frequency corresponding to

it. Here again the Disc is selective. If the pitch is slightly higher than a certain row of dots, then that row seems to move slowly backward, because each successive dot is not so far advanced as its predecessor when the light flash arrives. The consequent movement is apparently backwards, that is, opposed to the direction in which the Disc is moving. If the pitch is lower than a certain row of dots, then the movement is apparently forward, that is, with the direction of the rotation of the Disc, because the successive dots are just a little farther along when the light comes. If the frequency, then, is an odd number, one can still determine it by noting the two rows or circles, one of which moves in one way and the other the opposite direction. By noting the comparative speed of this forward or backward movement of the adjacent rows, one can judge with fair accuracy to a fraction of a vibration per second. Greater accuracy would be obtained, of course, by having a circle of dots for each integral vibration-frequency, as Seashore has on the Tonoscope. But such fineness of measurement will seldom be necessary, in all probability, in any experimental work in which this apparatus will be used.

Consider another possibility. Suppose a tone is given which is outside the range represented on the Disc, that is, from 128 d. v. to 256 d. v. As a matter of fact, the fact that the dots in a given row stand still is not an indication that the pitch is exactly indicated ! The real pitch may be an octave below, or one or two, or, theoretically, more octaves above. The octave is indicated by the apparent closeness of the dots. Thus, if the dots in row 192 stand still, and are spaced just as they are actually on the Disc, then the frequency of the vibration is 192. If the distance is half, that is, if there are apparently twice as many dots standing still as there are on the Disc in the same space, then the pitch is 384. If the distance is doubled, on the other hand, the pitch is 96, the frequency being halved.[3]

There is still another possibility. Suppose that it is a pitch change that it is desired to observe. Once more the selective principle becomes effective. As the frequency changes, the position of the dots standing still also changes. For example, with a change from 144 to 156, the dots on the circle containing 144 stand still first, and as soon as the latter frequency is intoned, the dots on the

[3] Seashore, C. E.: *Op. Cit.*

156 circle stand still. With a gradual change there is a succession of rows on which the dots remain momentarily motionless, the speed of the succession depending on the rate of the change of pitch. With a rise in pitch, the succession moves outward from the centre, while with a fall in pitch, the succession moves inward.

The uses to which such a device can be put in the speech laboratory are manifold. It was originally constructed with a view to using it in the undergraduate spech laboratory in an experimental study of the control of inflections. It has been found that students, even speech "majors," do not have unerring control over their pitch variations. The Stroboscopic Disc gives a visual, objective indication of the pitch being used, and also of the direction and amount of pitch change. Auditory perceptions can thus be checked by objective, visual means, in studying pitch, inflection, and speech melody.

The device has also been used with students in the freshman course, who seemed to be having difficulty in distinguishing and controlling their inflections. The results have been, on the whole, quite pleasing, although there have been insufficient cases on which to make a final report.

By a slight modification, the apparatus has been adapted to allow reading of pitch from phonograph records. The tone arm of the phonograph is connected, by means of rubber tubing, directly to the phonelescope. By slowing down the speed of the record by a known amount, the direction and amount of pitch change can be read immediately. It should be said that in many cases on the record, the sound dies away before the end so that it becomes too slight to actuate the diaphragm of the phonelescope. By a simple calculation, based on the relative speed of the record, the actual pitch and the amount of change can easily be determined.

Those who have seen the apparatus under operation, and those who have used it, agree that it may be of no inconsiderable value in the studies for which it was intended. There are some things it will not do: it will give no indication of quality or timbre; the only suggestion of intensity is given by the extent of the oscillation of the beam of light, and that is not always reliable; it will give no better indication of time values than is given by the unaided ear. It will give readings of pitch, and pitch alone. It will not give a permament record, as it is at present constructed; one must make

notations of the phenomena as they occur. But, especially with the phonograph record, these phenomena can be repeated, checked and rechecked as often as may be necessary.

With respect to the principle on which it operates, no originality is claimed. But it is thought that this simple device, "home-made," as was said, yet theoretically and practically sound, may be of some use to those who may have occasion to make certain studies in which it may be employed.

GOETHE'S RULES FOR ACTORS

A Translation With an Introduction

ARTHUR WOEHL
Cornell University

Goethe's fame as poet has overshadowed his fame as régisseur and stage director. Yet Goethe the régisseur and stage director contributed as much to German theatrical art as Goethe the poet to German literature. There was, properly speaking, nothing that could be called a German theatre up to the time of Goethe. It is true that there were theatre buildings, traveling companies, and a few actors of note. But in contrast with most of the other European countries, Germany, as she lacked a national political centre, lacked also a national theatrical centre. During the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries the country was overrun with English, French, Italian, and Dutch traveling companies which provided popular amusement in German translations of their own national plays, or else continued the tradition of the *Haupt-und-Staatsaktionen* or the Italian *commedia dell'arte*. There was nothing in Germany to compare with the Comedie Francaise or even the Danish Royal Theatre in Copenhagen, in both of which permanent troupes of actors where trained in the acting tradition of the plays of Racine or Moliere or Holberg.

The Court theatre at Weimar, under Goethe's direction, became the training school for a tradition of German acting, establishing a definite national impress which had far-reaching effects. Its effect upon German literature was equally great. To Goethe's recognition of the need of a special technique in writing for the stage, many of his plays, as well as Schiller's, owe their present

form. It was Goethe who defined the ideals and principles that have had the most profound influence on the German theatre down to the present day.

When, at the urgent invitation of Duke Karl August, Goethe came to the Court of the duchy of Weimar in 1775, he was twenty-six years of age and had already won distinction as the author of *Werther* and *Götz von Berlichingen*. At his arrival he found a small Court, some members of which were brilliant, all of which were interested chiefly in seeking pleasure. There was no theatre (the former theatre building was burned in 1774) but the Court delighted in open-air plays, masques, and pageants, and Goethe took an active part in producing and acting them. Many of his minor pieces were especially written for production during this period. It cannot be said, however, that he very seriously occupied himself with theatrical matters until 1791. He had become what Herder called the *pontifex maximus* of the Duke's territory, [1] serving as Privy Councillor, War Commissioner, President of the Chamber of Finance, Commissioner of Mines, and in many other capacities. In 1780 a new theatre building had been erected. It was let out in 1784 to Joseph Bellomo, the manager of a touring company. Bellomo had a very small subsidy from Duke Karl, but even so found it difficult to make ends meet. After a struggle of six years, he asked for a cancellation of his contract.

The Duke then determined to have his own company, but being unable to find a notable theatrical manager to take charge, he naturally turned to the man who was managing practically everything else in the duchy. So in 1791 Goethe became director of the Weimar Court Theatre.

From the beginning Goethe ruled with the hand of a tyrant, a kindly one to be sure, but tyrant nevertheless. He had little with which to work. Funds were small, the actors willing but untrained, and there was practically no theatre equipment. His ideal in stage production was a perfect *ensemble*, a harmony of the whole, and he labored endlessly to achieve it. He instituted reading rehearsals, where, before actual rehearsals began, each scene was gone over, action and business planned out, and all problems of interpretation discussed. Formal rehearsals were not common at this time: even

[1] P. Hume Brown, *Life of Goethe*, 2 vols. See Chap. XVII, XVIII, of Vol. I.

some of the better known actors were negligent in giving lines as the author had written then. Goethe's ideas on the value of regular and frequent rehearsals are expressed in some detail by Wilhelm Meister in a lecture to his traveling companions.[2] At Weimar Goethe consistently attended all rehearsals and dealt out summary punishment to any actor who infringed upon the rules.

With the coming of Schiller to Weimar in 1800 Goethe's interest in the theatre reached its peak, and the five years from then until Schiller's death were the brightest in the history of the theatre. It was during this period that the *Rules for Actors* were set down, though they had doubtless been taking shape in the author's mind for some years. The two great poets worked in almost perfect unanimity. Their ideals and ultimate purposes in theatrical art were the same, although they often differed in their means of attaining them. Their co-direction was a source of satisfaction to Goethe himself and Schiller's death in 1805 was a great blow to him. He continued his sole direction thereafter, but with increasing difficulty, thanks to the caprices of Caroline Jagemann, one of the actresses and the Duke's mistress. This talented actress and singer was too fond of intrigue and power not to cause trouble. She became ungovernable and the war between her and Goethe grew so intolerable to him that in 1808 he sent in his resignation, an event probably not unforeseen by the actress. At that time Goethe's wife, and also the Duchess, persuaded him to remain. In 1817, however, when the Duke, at the instigation of Caroline Jagemann, now titled Frau von Heygendorf, decided to bring to the theatre a play in which a trained dog was the hero, Goethe could endure it no longer and sent in a final resignation. From that time the Weimar theatre declined and quickly sank into oblivion.

Of the *Rules* themselves a few words are necessary. It will be noticed that they are, in general, mechanical and arbitrary. As rules for inexperienced actors, they are, it will also be noticed, in general both acute and sound. In practice, they gave rise to a severely classical style of declamation which Goethe favored. Mantzius remarks: "There is a well-known saying of Goethe's that he would undertake to make an actor out of any well-grown grenadier. Those words were no empty boast: for theatrical art of this

[2] Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*, trans. by Carlyle, Bk. IV, Chap. II, pp. 200-201.

kind not even a grenadier would be necessary.''[3] The system undeniably tended to reduce the players to automata. It is not unlikely that Goethe himself deplored his own system of training voice and body for the stage, but finding few of his actors who possessed enough education to work in any other way, decided to devote his energies to training them externally. Amateurs in any age have presented the same problem, and a set of rules is one way out.

Ludwig Tieck, though he admired Goethe's dramatic principles in other respects, violently opposed his method of stage delivery. Tieck maintained that the only proper speech for the stage was that based on ordinary conversation. However, the natural tone of conversation was actually not far from Goethe's own ideal. In *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship,* speaking of Frau Melina, he says: ''She soon acquired an accurate mode of playing; she attained the natural tone of conversation altogether, that of keen emotion she attained in some degree.''[4] And elsewhere in the same work he commends the actor for ''a high degree of truth, ease, and 'frankness,' '' while condemning ''our starched characters upon the stage.''[5] If he had among his actors any of real talent we may assume that he did not trouble them with rules. For the beginners or the dullards the *Rules* provided a compass to guide them until they were able to direct their own course.[6]

The strict discipline had its effect. Out of this small group of actors of average ability Goethe built a theatrical company which could claim a place among the first in Germany. His pupils carried the system to all parts of Germany. If it introduced a coldly external school of acting which had little to do with naturalness, it should be remembered that even that was an improvement over what had gone before. Moreover, it did nothing to harm the really great among the actors, for they were, as always, above mechanical rules of this kind.

The chief value of the *Rules* today is perhaps their historical significance. They are important and interesting when compared with the theories of Riccoboni, Talma, Coquelin, and others, which collectively give us our knowledge of changing ideals in acting.

[3] Karl Mantzius, *A History of Theatrical Art in Ancient and Modern Times,* 6 vols., Vol. VI, p. 267.

[4] Bk. V. Chap. XVI, p. 323.

[5] See Bk. IV, Chap. XVIII, p. 258, and Bk. II, Chap. XI, p. 119.

[6] See Section 90 of the *Rules for Actors.*

Rules For Actors[7]

1803

The art of the actor is made up of speech and bodily movement. In the following paragraphs we shall give some rules and suggestions on both of these, beginning with *speech*.[8]

DIALECT

1

When a provincialism creeps into a tragic discourse the most beautiful poetry is disfigured and the ear of the auditor is offended. Therefore, the first and most necessary point in the training of an actor is that he free himself from all errors of dialect and strive to attain a perfectly pure pronunciation. No provincialism will do on the stage ! Nothing must be heard there but pure German idiom, which has been cultivated through good taste, art, and science.[9]

2

He who has to struggle with the habits of dialect should adhere to the universal rules of German speech and seek to enunciate quite clearly the new forms he wishes to develop even more distinctly than they really ought to be. Even exaggerations are advisable in this case, without risk of detriment, for it is a peculiarity of human nature always to return willingly to its old customs, and of its own accord to normalize what has been exaggerated.

PRONUNCIATION

3

As in music the correct, precise, and pure striking of each single tone is the foundation of all further artistic execution, so in the art of the actor the clean and perfect pronunciation of each word is the basis of all higher recitation and declamation.

[7] I have used for the translation the text of the Weimar (1901) edition of *Goethe's Werke*, vol. 40.

[8] Italics mine.

[9] Although we may regard this as more or less of a commonplace, Goethe had every reason for insisting upon a standard of pure High German at Weimar. He himself spoke the language of his native Frankfurt; Schiller's speech was particularly broad Swabian; and the actors, collected from all parts of Germany, represented almost every other dialect.

4

Pronunciation is *perfect* when no letter of a word is suppressed, but when all appear according to their true value.

5

It is *clean* when all words are so delivered that the thought strikes the hearer easily and distinctly.

Both together make expression complete.

6

The actor should seek to acquire such a diction, realizing clearly how a slurred letter or a word pronounced indistinctly makes a whole sentence ambiguous, with the result that the audience loses the illusion and is often provoked to laughter, even in the most serious scenes.

7

In words that end in *em* or *en* one must be careful to express the final syllable clearly; otherwise this syllable is lost, since one does not hear the *e* at all.

For example:

folgendem, not *folgend'm*
horendem, not *horend'm*

8

One must also be careful of the letter *b*, which is very easily confused with *w*, with the result that the whole sense of the speech can be spoiled and made unintelligible.

For example:

Leben um *Leben*, not *Lewen* um *Lewen*.

9

So also *p* and *b*, *t* and *d*, must be markedly distinguished. Therefore the beginner should make a great difference in both, and should express *p* and *t* more strongly than they ordinarily would be, especially if, on account of his dialect, he would naturally incline to the opposite.

10

When the consonants that sound alike follow each other, because one word ends with the same letter with which the other begins, a pause must be made, in order to distinguish both words. For example:

Schliesst sie blühend den Kreis des Schönen.

There must be a pause between *blühend* and *den*.

11

One must especially guard against unclear utterance of all final syllables and final letters; in the first place, this rule is to be observed primarily with *m*, *n*, and *s*, because these letters designate the terminations which govern the chief word, consequently indicate the relation of the chief word to the rest of the sentence, and thus define the exact meaning of the sentence.

12

Furthermore, one must express chief words, proper names, and conjunctions clearly and distinctly. For example, in the verse

> But the Fury frightens me
> Protectress of this place,

the proper name *Fury* and the main word *protectress*, in this case very important, are prominent. Hence both must be enunciated with particular distinctness.

13

In general, proper names must be uttered with more emphasis than usual, because such a name is intended to strike the auditor particularly. For it very often happens that a person is mentioned in the first act who appears for the first time in the third act, and often even later. The public must be made aware of this fact. How can that be done except by clear, vigorous pronunciation ?

14

In order to perfect his diction, the beginner should utter everything very slowly, expressing syllables, and particularly final syllables, strongly and clearly, in order that the syllables which must be spoken rapidly be not unintelligible.

15

It is also advisable to speak in as low a pitch as possible at the beginning, and then, modulating, steadily to rise in tone; for by this means the voice attains great range and is trained to the different modulations needed in declamation.

16

For that reason it is also very well at the beginning to utter all syllables, whether long or short, as long, and in as low a tone as the voice allows, since otherwise in rapid speech one usually emphasizes only the verbs.

17

False or incorrect memorization is for many players the cause

of false and incorrect pronunciation. Before one entrusts anything to his memory, he should read, slowly and deliberately, the passage to be memorized. In this one must avoid all emotion, all declamation, all play of the imagination; but one must endeavor only to read correctly and then to learn accurately ; thus many an error, both of dialect and pronunciation, will be avoided.

RECITATION AND DECLAMATION

18

By *recitation* is understood a delivery which, without emotional raising of the tone, yet not quite without modulation, lies midway between cold, quiet speech and highly excited speech.

The auditor must always feel that in this case the speech is objective.

19

Therefore it is necessary to emphasize the passages to be recited and deliver them with the feeling and the sentiment which the content of the poem inspires in the reader; neverthless this should be done with moderation and without that emotional forgetfulness of self which is required in declamation. The reciter, to be sure, follows with the voice the ideas of the poet and the impression which is made on him by the mild or horrible, pleasing or displeasing subject; on the horrible he places the horrible tone, on the tender, the tender tone, on the solemn, the solemn tone, but these are merely results and effects of the impression which the subject matter makes on the reciter; he does not alter thereby his original character, he does not disown his nature, his individuality, and is to be compared with a piano upon which I play in its natural tone, given by the mode of construction. The passage which I deliver compels me to observe, by its composition, *forte* or *piano, dolce* or *furioso,* but this is done wiithout my using the modulation which the instrument possesses,—on the contrary, it is merely the overflowing of the soul into the fingers, which through their compliance, their stronger or weaker impressing and touching of the keys, put into the passage the spirit of the composition, and thereby excite the feelings which can be stirred by its content.

20

But it is quite different with *declamation* or heightened recitation. Here I must leave my inborn character, disavow my nature,

and place myself wholly in the attitude and mood of him whose rôle I declaim. The words which I utter must be brought out with energy and liveliest expression, so that I seem to experience each emotional impulse as actually present.

Here the player on the piano employs the soft pedal and all modulations which the instrument possesses. If they are used with taste, each in its proper place, and if the player has studied in advance, with spirit and diligence, the application and the effect which can be produced through them, then he can be sure of the most beautiful and completest result.

21

One might call the art of declamation an art of music in prose, since, in general, it has a great deal that is analogous to music. But one must make the distinction that music, answering its own purposes, moves with more freedom; the art of declamation, on the other hand, is much more limited in the range of its tones and is subject to an alien purpose. Of this principle the declaimer must always take the strictest consideration. For if he varies his tones too quickly, if he speaks either too low or too high, or through too many semitones, then he is singing; but in the opposite case he falls into monotony, which even in simple recitation is a mistake—two rocks, one as hazardous as the other, between which still a third lies sunken, to wit, the ministerial cadence. It is easy, while evading the one or the other danger, to run aground on this one.

22

In order to attain a correct declamation one must consider well the following rules:

If, to begin with, I completely understand the meaning of the words and have mastered them perfectly, then I must seek to accompany them with a suitable tone of voice, and express them as rapidly or slowly, as vigorously or gently, as the meaning of each sentence requires. For example:

Nations vanish—must be said half-loud, murmuringly.
Names are forgotten—must be said more clearly, more sonorously.
Dark oblivion spread dusky wings of night over whole races—must be said hollowly, deeply, and with terror.

23

In the following passage:

Quickly throwing myself from my steed
I press after him. . . etc.

a much faster tempo must be chosen than in the foregoing sentence; for the content of the words clearly demands it.

24

When passages occur which are interrupted by others, as if they were separated by marks of parenthesis, then what comes before and what goes after must be slightly separated, and the tone, which was interrupted by the intervening speech, must thereafter be continued. For example:

> And yet it is the first childish quarrel
> Which, propagated in an unhappy line,
> Has given birth to the newest misfortune of this day.

Must be declaimed thus:

> And yet it is the first childish quarrel
> Which—propagated in an unhappy line—
> Has given birth to the newest misfortune of this day.

25

When a word occurs which on account of its meaning is suited to an intensified utterance, or which perhaps in and for itself, on account of its own nature and not on account of the meaning it is made to carry, must be expressed with a more strongly articulated tone, then one must take care not to abandon suddenly the quiet delivery, vociferate with full force this significant word, and then relapse to the quiet tone; but one must prepare the hearer, as it were, by a judicious distribution of emphasis, by giving a more articulate tone to the preceding words, then modulate up to the significant word, so that it is uttered in a full and round union with the others. For example, in the line

> Among the sons' fiery strength,

the word *fiery* is one which in and for itself demands more emphasis; consequently it must be declaimed with intensified tone. Accordingly, it would be very incorrect if I suddenly broke off the tone on the preceding word *sons'* and then delivered the word *fiery* with vehemence; rather, I must give a more articulate tone to the word *sons'* so that I can progress by degrees to that amplitude of expression which the word *fiery* requires. Spoken in this manner it will of course sound full and beautiful and the ultimate aim of the expression will be completely attained.

26

When several words follow the exclamation *O!* a pause must

be made, and made so that the *O!* in itself constitutes an exclamation.

For example:

O! —my mother!
O! —my sons!
not:
O my mother!
O my sons!

27

Just as it is recommended in pronunciation that proper names be spoken clearly and distinctly, so the very same rule is repeated in declamation, with the addition only, that the more strongly articulated tone is required. For example:

Not, where golden Ceres laughs,
And peaceful Pan, the guardian of these fields

In this verse two significant proper names occur—names containing the whole sense. If, therefore, the declaimer glides over them lightly, even though he may speak them clearly and perfectly, the whole passage loses immeasurably. It will of course occur to the educated person when he hears the names that they are derived from the mythology of the ancients, but the true meaning in them can escape him; through the stressed tone of the person speaking them, however, the meaning will be clear to him. Likewise for the man of little education, if the peculiar import is not known, the more strongly articulated tone will excite the imagination, and he will fancy under these names something analogous to that which they truly mean.

28

The declaimer is free to select his own stops, pauses, and so forth; but he must guard against destroying the true meaning, which he can do by this means just as easily as by an omitted or badly expressed word.[10]

[10] Anton Genast, stage manager at the Weimar Theatre, tells us of the extreme care and attention which Goethe gave to pauses after punctuation marks. At a reading-rehearsal of Calderon's *The Constant Prince* he laid down definite rules. "He was extremely painstaking about this: Commas, semicolons, colons, exclamation and question marks had to be strictly observed in recitation; he demanded a pause for each of these marks and denoted their varying lengths graphically in this fashion: -, --; ---! ----? -------." Edward Genast: *Aus Weimars klassicher und nachklassischer Zeit* (Classical and Post-Classical Times at Weimar) pp. 107-8.

29

One can readily understand from these few observations what unending toil and time it costs to make progress in this difficult art.

30

For the beginning actor it is very beneficial always to speak everything as deeply as possible. For thus he gains a great range in voice and can give perfectly all further shadings. But if he habitually begins too high, he soon loses masculine depth of tone and with it the true expression of the lofty and spiritual. And how can he be assured of success with a shrill and squeaking voice? If he has completely mastered the lower register he will certainly be able to express perfectly all possible shadings.

RHYTHMICAL DICTION

31

All the rules and observations made under the head of declamation are here presupposed as fundamental. But it is especially the character of rhythmical delivery that the subject must be declaimed with an even more lofty and emotional expression. Each word is to be uttered with a certain impressiveness.

32

The rhythmical structure as well as the end-rhymes must not be indicated too strikingly, but the context must be observed as in prose.

33

If one has iambics to declaim he must be careful to indicate the beginning of each verse by a slight, scarcely perceptible pause, not sufficient, however, to interrupt the flow of the declamation.[11]

POSTURE AND MOVEMENT OF THE BODY ON THE STAGE

34

On this part of the player's art some general principles may also be given, to which, of course, there are innumerable exceptions, all of which, however, go back again to the principles. We must

[11] This practice was especially scored by Tieck. See his essay, "Uber das Temps, in welchem auf der Bühne gesprochen werden soll" (On the Time Which Should Be Observed in Stage Delivery), *Dramaturgische Blätter*, Vol. II.

strive so vigorously to assimilate these that they become second nature.

35

First, the player must reflect that he must not only imitate Nature, but must also present her ideally, and that therefore his presentation must unite the true with the beautiful.

36

Hence each part of the body must be completely in his control so that he can make use of each member for the desired expression, freely, harmoniously, and gracefully.

37

Let the position of the body be erect, the chest up, the upper half of the arms to the elbows close to the body, the head turned slightly towards the person to whom one is speaking, yet so slightly that three-quarters of the face is always turned towards the audience.

38

For the actor must constantly remember that he is on the stage for the sake of the public.

39

Accordingly, it is mistaken naturalness for the actors to play to each other as if no third person were present; they should never play in profile, nor turn their backs to the audience. If it is done for the sake of characterization or of necessity, let it be done with judgment and grace.

40

One must also be especially careful never to speak in toward the stage, but always speak out toward the public. For the player must always divide his attention between two objects: that is, between the person to whom he is speaking and his audience. Instead of turning the whole head away, it is better, when necessary, merely to turn the eyes.

41

It is a cardinal point that when two actors are playing together, the speaker always moves back, and the one who has stopped speaking moves down slightly. If one makes use of this advantage with understanding, and through practice can go about it quite without constraint, the best effect arises for the eye as well as for the intelligibility of the speech. A player who masters this will,

with others equally skilled, produce a very fine effect and have a great advantage over those who do not observe it.

42

If two persons are conversing, the one who stands on the left should guard against pressing too closely on the person on the right. The distinguished person (women, elders, superiors) always always stands on the right side. Even in ordinary life one keeps some distance from one whom he respects; the contrary argues a lack of breeding. The player should show himself a cultivated person and for that reason should observe this rule most rigidly. The one who stands on the right side must therefore maintain his right and must not permit himself to be pushed toward the wings, but hold his ground and perhaps with his left hand signal the obtrusive one to keep his distance.

43

A fine pensive attitude, for a young man, for example, is this: keep the fourth dance position, the chest and the whole body turned directly out, the head slightly inclined to the side with the eyes fixed on the ground and both arms left hanging.[12]

CARRIAGE AND MOVEMENT OF THE HANDS AND ARMS

44

In order to attain free movement of the hands and arms, actors never carry a walking-stick.

45

They must completely avoid this new-fangled manner of placing the hand in the breast of the long waistcoat.[13]

46

It is extremely incorrect to hold the hands either over each other or resting on the stomach, or to stick one, or perhaps even both, in the waistcoat.

[12] There is a remarkable similarity between rules for training the actors in the *Hauptaktionen* of a century earlier and the rules in this and following paragraphs. See Mantzius, vol. V, pp. 24-26.

[13] With this and the following paragraph, compare a quotation from Mantzius, vol. V, p. 328, where a colleague says of Thomas Betterton: "Mr. Betterton . . . had fat short Arms, which he rarely lifted higher than his Stomach—his Left Hand frequently lodg'd in his Breast, between his Coat and Waist-coat, while with his Right, he repar'd his Speech."

47

The hand itself must neither be clenched, nor be held in soldier-like fashion, with the whole palm lying along the thigh, but the fingers must be held partly half-curved, partly straight, but never stiff.

48

The two middle fingers should always remain together, the thumb, index, and little finger hanging somewhat curved. In this manner the hand is in its proper position and in its correct form for all movements.

49

The upper half of the arms should always rather hug the body and move in a much smaller arc than the lower half, which should have the greatest flexibility. For if I raise my arm but slightly when the discussion is about ordinary things, so much more effect is produced when I extend it above my head. If I do not moderate my motion in the weaker expressions of my speech, I have not force enough for the stronger ones and thus the gradation of the effect is entirely lost.

50

Moreover, the hands should never return to their position of rest until I am about to conclude my speech, and then only by degrees as the speech draws to a close.

51

Movement of the arms always occurs part by part. First of all the hand lifts or moves, then the elbows, and then the whole arm. It should never be raised all at once, without the succession just mentioned, for the movement would appear wooden and unsightly.

52

It is of great advantage to a beginner to force himself to hold his elbows at his sides as much as possible, thus gaining control over this portion of his body and attaining the ability to execute his gestures according to the rule just laid down. Let him train himself, therefore, in ordinary life always to hold his arms bent back, or indeed, if he is alone, tied back. In walking or in unoccupied movements, let him allow the arms to hang, never compress the hands, but keep the fingers constantly in motion.

53

The picturing gesture with the hands must seldom be used, yet it should not be entirely omitted.

54

One must be on his guard against indicating with the hand any portion of his body that is spoken of; for example, when Don Manuel in *The Bride of Messina,* [14] says to his chorus:

> Choose too a cloak woven
> Of gleaming silk, of a pale shimmering purple,
> Fasten upon the shoulder a golden cicada.

It would be extremely incorrect if the player were to touch his shoulder with his hand at the last words.

55

If picturing gestures must be used let them appear unintentional.

In particular cases there are exceptions here also, but this can and should be taken as a general rule.

56

The picturing gesture with hand against the breast to designate one's own person must be used as seldom as possible, and then only if the meaning unconditionally requires it, as for example, in the following passage from *The Bride of Messina:*

> I—have brought no more hate;
> I scarcely even know why we cruelly fought.

Here the first *I* may properly be marked with the picturing gesture by the motion of the hand against the breast.

To make this gesture beautifully, however, one must notice that the elbow must be quite separated from the body and then the arm must be raised; still the hand must not be brought up to the breast with a wide swing. The hand must not be placed flat on the breast, but must barely touch it with the thumb and the fourth finger. The other three must be held, not lying on, but curved over the arch of the breast, as if conforming to it.

57

In moving the hands one must, as much as possible, avoid bringing the hand before the face or covering the body with it.

58

If I must extend my hand, and the right hand is not expressly

[14] Schiller's *Greek tragedy.*

demanded, I can just as well use the left; for there is no right or left on the stage—one must only try constantly not to spoil the picture to be presented by an unsuitable position. If, however, I am unavoidably forced to extend the right hand, and if I am so placed that I would have to extend my hand across my body, it is preferable to step back a little and extend it so that my body remains *en face.*

59

The player must bear in mind on which side of the theatre he is standing, in order to adapt his gesture accordingly.

60

He who stands on the right side must gesture with the left hand, and conversely, he who stands on the left side must gesture with the right, so that the breast will be covered as little as possible by the arms.

61

In impassioned speeches where one gestures with both hands this consideration must nevertheless be fundamental.

62

For exactly the same purpose, and so that the breast be turned towards the audience, it is advantageous for the one who stands on the right side to keep the left foot forward, the one on the left to keep the right foot forward.

PANTOMIME

63

To attain a correct pantomime and also to be able to criticize it rightly, one should note the following rules:

Let one place himself before a mirror and speak what he is to declaim, only softly, or rather not at all, let him simply think the words. The advantage of this is that he is not carried along by the declamation but can easily perceive every false move, which does not express what is thought or softly uttered, just as he can also select beautiful and suitable gesture and imprint on the whole pantomime, as a stamp of art, a movement corresponding to the meaning of the words.

64

But this presupposes that the player has previously made fully his own the character and the whole situation of the person he is to represent, and that his imagination works on the material pro-

perly; for without this preparation he will be able neither to declaim nor to act correctly.

65

It is of great advantage for the beginner, in order to master pantomime and make his arms pliant and supple, to try to make his rôle intelligible to another without reciting it, solely by pantomime; for in that case he is forced to select the most suitable gestures.

TO BE OBSERVED IN REHEARSAL

66

To acquire an easier and more suitable movement of the feet one must never rehearse in boots.

67

Let the actor, particularly the younger man, who has to play lovers and other light rôles, keep a pair of slippers at the theatre in which to rehearse, and he will soon notice the good effects of this practice.[15]

68

One should not permit himself to do anything in rehearsal that he cannot do in the play.

69

The women should put aside their small purses.

70

No actor should rehearse in a cloak, but should have the hands and arms free, as in the play. For the cloak not only hinders him from making proper gestures, but forces him to acquire false ones, which he then repeats involuntarily in the presentation.

71

The actor should also make no movement in rehearsal which is unsuitable to the rôle.

72

He who places his hand in his bosom in rehearsing tragic rôles runs the risk, in the actual performance, of fumbling for an opening in his armour.

[15] The same advice is given the players in *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*, Bk. V, Chap. VIII, p. 295. Many other suggestions in this chapter parallel closely the advice given here.

BAD HABITS TO BE AVOIDED

73

Among the very clumsy errors to be avoided is this: the actor who is sitting should not, in order to bring his chair farther forward, pass his hands between his legs, seize the chair, then raise himself slightly, and so drag it forward. This is an offense not only against appearance, but still more against comfort.

74

The actor should show no pocket-handkerchief on the stage; even less should he blow his nose, still less should he spit.[16] It is frightful, in the midst of an artistic production, to be reminded of these natural occasions. One may have with him a small handkerchief, as indeed is now the fashion, as a help in case of need.[17]

BEARING OF THE ACTOR IN ORDINARY LIFE

75

In ordinary life, too, the actor must remember that he is to be part of a public presentation.

76

Hence he must guard himself against habitual gesture, postures, and positions of the arms and body, for if during the play his attention must be directed to avoiding such habits, it is to be a great extent lost to the play.

77

It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that the actor be completely free from all habits, so that in the presentation he can

[16] Goethe's impression of this may well have been obtained from the actor Konrad Ekhof, who was guest player at Weimar about two years after Goethe's arrival. He appeared in a play with Goethe, the Duke Karl August, and others. Although a famous actor of some attainment, he had a number of crude mannerisms, among which were spitting and coughing on the stage.

[17] The use of the handkerchief on the stage was a French habit. Vanhove, Talma's father-in-law, found two properties indispensable: a handkerchief in tragedy, a snuff-box in domestic drama—and he would willingly have introduced the habit of using the snuff-box in tragedy also. He did do this on one occasion. Moreover, when presented with his first historically correct Roman costume, he called the tailor's attention to the lack of a pocket, asking him whether he was to believe that the Romans did not blow their noses or blew them with their fingers. He got the pocket.

imagine himself completely in his rôle and busy his mind with his assumed character.

78

On the contrary, it is an important principle for the actor to take pains in ordinary life to give such a turn to his body, his bearing, indeed to all his actions, that he will be kept in constant practice. This will be of untold advantage for every part of the actor's art.

79

He who has chosen to be a tragic actor will perfect himself if he seeks to bring out everything that he has to say with a certain accuracy of tone as well as of expression, and also to retain in all gestures a certain lofty manner. This of course must not be carried too far, lest he become a laughing-stock for his fellow men, but with this limitation he may let them constantly recognize the artist training himself. This does him no dishonor, indeed, they will endure quite willingly his peculiar bearing when because of this it happens that they are compelled to look on him with astonishment on the stage as a great artist.

80

Inasmuch as we wish to have everything represented on the stage not only truly, but also beautifully, since the eye of the spectator wishes to be charmed by pleasing groupings and positions, the actor must strive to preserve these even when off the stage; he should always imagine before him a roomful of spectators.

81

When he is learning the rôle by heart he must constantly address himself to an audience; even when he sits at table, by himself or with others, he should always strive to form a picture, taking up and setting down everything with a certain grace, as if it were on the stage. In such a manner he must always form part of a picture.

ARRANGEMENT AND GROUPING ON THE STAGE

82

The stage and the auditorium, the actors and the audience, constitute essentially a single whole.

83

The theatre is to be regarded much as a figureless tableau to which the actor adds the figures.

84

Therefore one must never play too near the wings.

85

Just as seldom must one step into the proscenium. This is the greatest impropriety; for the figure steps out of the room in which it makes a complete unit with the scene-picture and with the fellow-players.

86

When one stands alone on the stage, let him remember that he is called upon to decorate the stage, and so much the more so since the attention remains directed quite alone on him.

87

As the augurs with their staff divided the heavens into various parts, the actor can mentally divide the stage into various rooms, which for experiment can be represented on paper by rhombic planes. The stage floor is then a kind of drafting-board; for the actor can determine which houses he will set foot in; he can make a memorandum of them on paper and is then certain that he will not rage artlessly to and fro in impassioned speeches, but will join the beautiful to the significant.

88

He who steps out for a monologue from the wings upstage does well to move diagonally, so that he reaches the opposite side of the proscenium; since in general diagonal movements are very pleasing.

89

He who comes out from the farthest wing to another who is already standing on the stage, must not walk out parallel with the wings but must turn slightly towards the prompter.

90

One must make his own the sense of all these technical-grammatical rules, and constantly practice them so that they become habit. Stiffness must disappear and the rule become only the hidden outline of the living action.

91

This takes for granted that these rules will be observed primarily when one has noble, worthy characters to represent.[18]. On the other hand, there are characters which are opposite to these

[18] i. e. the *Rules* have special reference to the acting of tragedy.

noble ones, for example, the boors, the louts, and so forth. These he will represent so much the better if, with art and understanding, he does the opposite, always remembering, however, that it should be an imitated presentation and not a vulgar actuality.

A SURVEY OF PHONETICS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED STATES*

SARAH T. BARROWS
State University of Iowa

The data on which this report is based were obtained from

1. Answers to the questionnaires sent out by the Modern Foreign Language Study.
2. The Survey of Linguistic Studies issued by the Linguistic Society.
3. A study of college and university catalogues.
4. Personal letters from persons especially interested in the field of phonetics.

The study reveals a noticeable growth of interest in phonetics. The subject of phonetics is taught in one hundred and fifty-three institutions of collegiate rank,[1] either as an independent course or as a part of a teacher's course, or practice course.

I. Applied Phonetics

1. Foreign Languages

Romance Departments show the greatest activity in phonetics. In one hundred and sixteen institutions, instruction in French phonetics is given; in fifty-three institutions, instruction in Spanish, and in five instutions, instruction in Italian phonetics is offered.

In three institutions, the department of Romance Languages offers a course in general phonetics; in nine in-

* Read at the meeting of the Modern Language Association in Boston, 1926.

[1] These figures are probably only approximately correct. Much of the information obtained refers to the situation a year or more ago, and courses in phonetics may have been added since; on the other hand, some institutions reporting courses in phonetics may have used the term rather broadly, and they may have referred to the *phonetic method* in teaching languages rather than to *courses* in *phonetics*.

stitutions, sometimes alone, sometimes in coöperation with other departments, the Romance department has established a phonetic laboratory.

In forty-seven institutions instruction in German phonetics is given.

Courses in Hebrew, Norse, and Latin phonetics are each reported by one institution only.

Three institutions report courses in phonetics for four modern foreign languages, French, Spanish, German, and Italian; fourteen report courses in Spanish, French, and German; two in French, Italian, and German. In eighteen institutions courses in French and Spanish, in thirteen schools courses in French and German phonetics are given. In fifty-four institutions courses in French phonetics only are given; in seventeen, courses in Spanish only; in thirteen, courses in German only are given.

2. English

Interest in English phonetics seems to be just awakening. Only sixteen schools report courses in English phonetics and in one of these the course is given in the Summer Session and in the Extension department only. Three are designated as English Phonetics for Foreigners. In most cases these courses are given not in English departments but in Speech departments. The following institutions report courses in English Phonetics given by speech departments: Hunter College, State University of Iowa, University of Michigan, Rockford College. Simmons College, Smith College, Stanford University, University of Utah, University of Wisconsin.

II. General Phonetics

Fifteen institutions report courses in general or comparative phonetics: Catholic University, Chicago Universersity, Columbia University, Cornell University, Harvard University, Hunter College, State University of Iowa, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, New York University, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, University of Pennsylvania, University of Pittsburg, and Yale University. These courses are offered

by departments of philology, by modern language departments and (in two cases only) by departments of speech.

III. Experimental Phonetics

Eleven institutions report phonetics (or voice science) laboratories; three others announce laboratories to be equipped next year. These fourteen institutions are: University of Chicago, Hunter College, State University of Iowa, Middlebury College, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, New Jersey College for Women, New York University, Ohio State University, Purdue University, University of Southern California, Smith College, University of Utah, University of Wisconsin. In several instances these laboratories are interdepartmental; in most cases they are under the direction of either the department of Romance languages or the department of speech. Research bearing on phonetic subjects is being carried on by departments of physics and psychology in several institutions, but these departments are not included in this survey.

IV. Institutions Strong in Phonetics

Chicago seems to lead all other institutions in activity in phonetics. There courses are offered in French, Spanish, Italian, and German phonetics, and in experimental phonetics. Three courses in general phonetics are given in three different departments, those of Romance languages, sociology, and Oriental languages.

The University of Michigan also offers a variety of opportunities for the study of phonetics. Courses in general phonetics and experimental phonetics are offered by the department of Comparative Linguistics, there are courses in English, French, and German phonetics, and there is an interdepartmental phonetic laboratory under the direction of the department of Comparative Linguistics.

In Ohio State University, courses are given in French, Spanish, and German phonetics, and in general phonetics. Under the direction of the department of Romance languages, there is a large and well-equipped phonetic labora-

tory. In the University of Utah, courses are given in French, Spanish, German, and English phonetics. The phonetic laboratory of the Romance department in the University of Utah is one of the earliest and best-known laboratories in this country. At the State University of Iowa, the work is characterized by interdepartmental cooperation. The courses in phonetics (French, English, and General phonetics) are given in the Romance and speech departments, but special courses in acoustics and anatomy of the vocal organs are given by the departments of Physics and Anatomy, respectively, and the equipment of the psychology laboratory is available to those students who wish to do research in experimental phonetics.

In New York City, three institutions are active in phonetics. Columbia University has long been known as a well-spring of interest in phonetics. There courses are given in English, French, and German phonetics and in general phonetics. Hunter College offers, in addition to the above courses, Latin phonetics and experimental phonetics. In New York University there is a phonetic laboratory and courses in French phonetics and in general phonetics are given.

Among the women's colleges, Smith College offers most to the student interested in phonetics. Here courses in French, Spanish, and English phonetics are given and there is a phonetic laboratory under the joint direction of the departments of French and Oral English.

V. Activity in Phonetics According to States

In thirty-eight states, phonetics is taught in at least one institution of collegiate rank. New York and Ohio tie for leadership, each having thirteen institutions in which instruction in phonetics is given. Pennsylvania and Illinois follow, with eleven institutions offering instruction in phonetics; in Minnesota and Iowa there are six; in Massachusetts, California, and Missouri, there are five, and in North Carolina, Indiana, and Michigan, four institutions in which students may obtain instruction in phonetics.

A few years ago, it was necessary for the student who desired work in phonetics to go to Europe. It is clear that adequate training in phonetics may now be obtained in this country. The day of the pioneer in phonetics is over.

SOME RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SPEECH DEFECTS, MUSICAL DISABILITY, SCHOLASTIC ATTAINMENT AND MALADJUSTMENT

SARA M. STINCHFIELD
Mount Holyoke College

During the past four years at Mount Holyoke College, work in Speech Correction has seemed to be closely linked with personnel problems, as many of the girls classified in the special speech group have become personnel problems at some point in the college career. In the department of Psychology we have this year been trying to work out certain relationships between speech difficulties, disabilities in music and in scholastic attainment. We had noticed that girls in the speech correction group rarely appeared on Phi Beta Kappa lists or rose to the top in college activities, scholarship, leadership or artistic attainment.

Analysis for a four-year period showed that in the year 1923-24 four or 50% of the girls sent home at mid-semester for failure in college work, had been classified in the speech correction group. In the year 1924-25 the two lowest scores in the entering class, in scholarship, were made by girls in the same group, both of whom failed at the end of the first semester, one with and the other without speech training. In the same year 8 of the corrective group girls were in the highest fifth of the Freshman class in scholarship at the end of the first semester, 27 close to the median and 12 in the lowest scholarship group. During the year 1925-26 when no students with conditions were accepted, 11 of the 14 girls who failed in the September competitive examinations had been classified in the speech correction group. It was found in the same year that 41% of the girls in this group had made low scores in silent and in oral reading at the beginning of the Freshman year.

These facts seemed to suggest that the special group might be made up of students who were inferior in scholarship and in intelligence generally, but before such conclusions could be reached, it was necessary to analyze the situation more carefully, and to compare with a standard or control group.

First it was necessary to find the distribution of all Freshmen in the speech tests, which are given every fall at Mount Holyoke. For the four years 1922-25, including a study of 1126 students, we find that 33% of the total number have been about equally distributed in the Corrective and Superior Groups. The remainder, consisting of those *not satisfactory* but held for speech classes, or *just passing* the tests constitute 67% of the total number examined.

The largest single cause for placement in the corrective group is oral inaccuracy (very ineffective speech). Next comes vocal peculiarities; third, lisping. Other causes are stuttering, foreign accent letter substitution, provincial dialect, deafness with oral inaccuracy and paralysis affecting speech organs.

What were the facts regarding scholarship and intelligence, for the girls in the special corrective group? We found that there had been as many girls of high standing in intelligence, as there have been of low standing. The proportions of those in the two highest groups and in the two lowest groups are about equal. In scholarship however we see a different picture in studying the graph, as we find a decided drop in scholarship by the end of the Freshman year, so that we have a larger number in the two lowest groups in scholarship, than in the high scholarship groups. This indicates that the scholarship has not fulfilled the promise of the entrance examinations and of the intelligence tests. That is, in scholarship we find 32% in the two highest groups, 52% in the two lowest groups, and 16% close to the mid-line. Comparing this with intelligence tests we find that 43% of these girls were in the two highest groups, 33% in the two lowest groups and 24% in the middle group.

It is evident that something has happened to these students academically, and whether the speech defect stands in any causal relationship to the maladjustment, or whether it is only one symptom of a deep-seated emotional instability, organ inferiority, faulty training in earlier years or other personality factors, is one of the

points which we wish to make some attempt to solve. Certainly the ineffective speech reaction is closely linked with the emotional life. The more intelligent girls seem to make a better social adaptation, and the student leaders are rarely recruited from the corrective group.

The material analyzed this year is from the following sources:

(a) Records in the Physical Education and Health Departments.
(b) College Entrance Board Examinations.
(c) Scores in Scholastic Aptitude Tests.
(d) Seashore Tests for the Measurement of Musical Talent.
(e) Blanton-Stinchfield Speech Measurements.
(f) Records in the Dean's office.
(g) Miscellaneous sources.
(i. e. the heads of houses were not directly consulted).

For comparison we selected two groups of this year's entering students, first all those in the special corrective speech group, consisting of 41 students, and second an equal number of girls in the superior speech group, taken at random on the basis of placement in the speech tests given in the fall of the current year (1926).

The Health records show that the physical condition of the corrective group differs very little from that of the superior group, on the whole. Both are in comparatively good physical condition at college entrance. The girls in the corrective group show a somewhat greater tendency towards certain respiratory diseases such as frequent colds, influenza and tonsilitis, while the superior group gives a history of a larger number of tonsilectomies performed. This may indicate that the mouths and throats of the superior group are in somewhat better condition, in that oral and nasal hygiene seems to be more frequently observed. Both groups show an equal susceptibility to children's diseases of childhood. Enlarged glands or goitre indications are equal in the two groups. Reports of very poor posture are listed in the corrective group only; weak heart and fainting spells (1 case of each) occur in the corrective group only. Chronic pharyngitis or congested pharynx at the time of physical examination occurred in an equal proportion of the two groups, there being several in both groups.

Table I. shows the median scores of the two groups in College

Entrance Board Examinations and in the Psychological examinations, (Scholastic Aptitude Test) given at the same time.

TABLE I

	Median Scores Special Corrective Group	Superior Speech Group
1. College Entrance Board Examinations	71.8	77.3
2. Scholastic Aptitude Test	543 (Grade C)	544 (Grade C)

Just as we found in a study covering four years, for scholarship and intelligence, we find here that the scholastic performance has not come up to the promise given in the Intelligence (Scholastic Apti.) test. The higher grade in scholarship is attained by the students in the superior speech group, but there is little difference in native intelligence, as indicated by the test results.

Table II. shows the standing of the special speech group and the superior speech group in both the Stinchfield-Blanton Speech Measurements, and in the Seashore Tests for Musical Talent. The mean average for the team of speech tests is 106.6 for the corrective group, and 111.1 for the superior group. In the Seashore Tests the score is C— for the special group, and C for the superior group.[1]

TABLE II

Showing Ratings of the Special and Superior Groups in Special Tests

a. Blanton-Stinchfield Speech Measurements.

b. Seashore Tests for Musical Talent.

	Median Scores Special Group	Superior Group	No. of cases 41 per Group or Total of 82
Speech index in objective speech tests	13	15	
Subjective speech rating	14	17	
Articulation Test A	93	97	
Articulation Test B	93	98	
Oral Reading rate (per min.)	184	180	
Silent Reading Rate (per min.)	274	294	
Spontaneous Speech rate	120	132	(wds. per min.)
% of relevant words	95%	96%	
Vocabulary	74	72	(Terman norm 65 words)
Average	106.6	111.1	
B. Seashore Music Tests	C–	C	

[1] The highest score made by any member of the class in the Seashore Tests was B, so the grade of C is not so low as it sounds.

In a correlation between the Objective Speech Ratings for the two groups, and the College Entrance Board Examination scores, we find a negative correlation, or in fact that apparently little or no relationship exists. Apparently the two do not test closely related functions as there seems to be no connection between speech performances as shown in Articulation, Oral and Silent Reading, Vocabulary, Spontaneous Speech when compared with scholarship. Those who make low scores in one, may be fairly high in the other.

Correlation between objective speech rating and College Entrance Board Examinations.

1. Corrective group —.04
2. Superior group —.14

This leads to the statement that superior scholarship does not insure freedom from speech defects any more than low scholarship implies their presence.

There is considerable variation in *silent reading rate.* In a difference of 20 words per minute, for instance, one would find a difference of 1200 words per hour between slow and fast readers, or roughly a difference of six to ten pages an hour. The scores in *Oral Reading* are too close in the above table to call for comment, except to say that the average rate is faster than that maintained by the best radio broadcasters and public speakers. The median in oral reading, for the four years has been between 170 and 190 words per minute, and the median given in the table above lies

TABLE III

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND DEAN'S OFFICE

a. Dean's Office.

	Corrective Group	Superior Group
Penalties inflicted	2 (cases)	2 (cases)
Partially self-supporting	1	2
Complaint from house matrons and others*	2	0

b. Board of Admissions.

Showing percentage of those from private and public schools.

	Corrective Group	Superior Group
Preparatory training public H. S.	65%	54%
In private schools (at least 1 yr)	35%	46%
Total	100%	100%

* Both of these girls from families of high social standing.

within this range. The median for four years, in silent reading, has been 220-300 words per minute, and the rate in the table above was within these limits.

This compares favorably with the findings for both Mount Holyoke and Smith Colleges in the fall of 1923, when it was found that a larger number of girls held for speech correction were from public schools, while those from private schools seemed to pass the tests with greater ease.

Results of one semester's training in speech correction (1926-27).

Of the 27 girls receiving special corrective training during the first semester of this year, the results to date are as follows: The eight foreign accent cases with two exceptions have made rapid and satisfactory progress. The two who were unsatisfactory have also had great difficulty in scholarship and adjustment.

Of the 19 remaining girls, 8 show marked improvement. These are also in the high scholarship group; 2 in the same group have made little speech improvement; in the poor scholarship group 4 have made satisfactory progress and 4 have made little improvement since the beginning of the year. The remainder of those held for speech correction do not report until the second semester, so they are not included in this statement of progress.

CONCLUSIONS

I. The findings indicate that speech, intelligence, scholarship and auditory discrimination may be related, but not in a "causal sequence." On the whole, the students of higher intelligence seem more stable emotionally and make a better type of adjustment in college life.

II. Sense of pitch, sense of intensity and tonal memory as shown by the Seashore Music Tests enter into the function of speech and should therefore be considered in the application of corrective measures. The median score for the speech defective is C—, and for the superior speech group is C.

III. The off-hand estimate of the speech performance and personality of the girl without speech handicaps is higher than the estimate of girls who are in the corrective group.

IV. The objective performance of the superior or normal speaker is higher than that of the speech defective in such perform-

ances as Articulation, Silent Reading and percentage of relevant words used in Spontaneous Speech.

V. The scholastic attainment of the special group at the time of entrance to college is inferior to that of the superior group. The scholastic attainment of the special group remains inferior to that of the superior group, at the end of the Freshman year.

VI. On the basis of general intelligence and whatever factors this includes, the two groups are about equal as shown by the Scholastic Aptitude Tests. The special group however is more subject to a sharp decline in college work by the end of the first year.

VII. Near the end of the first semester the office records do not indicate that there are many more cases of maladjustment in the speech group, as compared with the superior group, but by the end of the Freshman year a good many maladjustments have occured in the special group, each year for four years.

VIII. A larger percentage of girls in the special group come from public, rather than from private schools. In the superior speech group the larger number come from private schools.

IX. The physical condition of girls in both groups seem to be equally good at entrance to college. There are indications that the superior group has observed better mouth and throat hygiene. The special group shows a greatly tendency to respiratory diseases. There seems to have been no difference in the two groups in the matter of susceptibility to childhood diseases.

X. The range in the distribution of scores in the Seashore Music Tests was from D—to B in both groups, but the median for the superior group was C and that for the special group was C—

XI. Since there is no correlation between the scores in Objective Speech Rating and College Entrance Board Examinations, in either the special or the superior group, it appears that the two tests probably measure quite different functions.[2]

[2] This is in agreement with the findings of Travis at State University of Iowa as reported in the Iowa Studies, regarding the correlation of Seashore Music Tests with the qualifying examination.

XII. There is some evidence that the more intelligent students respond more rapidly to corrective treatment than do the duller students, as illustrated by the findings for the first semester of the year 1926-27.

XIII. In no case, in either group, was there on record, previous

to the giving of the speech tests, any mention of speech or behavior difficulties even in cases where they were obviously of a type to be of economic and social concern to the student. Neither home nor school had reported in a single instance in these two groups, any outstanding characteristics having to do with the personality and social adjustment of the student.

XIV. Some opportunity should be given for speech and personality ratings in college entrance board records, by those qualified to judge the same, as it plays an increasingly important part in the student's social and economic life.

SUGGESTION

EDWIN H. PAGET
Purdue University

Although the term "suggestion" is very widely used by both the teachers of speech and the psychologists, there is an unusual variation in its meaning. Suggestion is made to include hypnotism, repetition of a slogan or an unsupported assertion, excessive emotional appeal, imitation, social pressure, customs, traditions, the use of authority, the influence of a "psychological crowd" on its own members, the communication of information to the ignorant and uninformed, vivid imagery, indirect suggestion of the Brutus-is-an-honorable-man type, cleverly worded appeals to the so-called subconscious mind, auto-suggestion, the use of size and intensity, and numerous other variations. There are few words more loosely or more widely used.

Here, certainly, is a problem for research by students in the field. It is important that the teacher of Speech know exactly what the term means when he uses it. The purpose of this paper is not to solve the problem, but merely to present the major difficulties.

The immediate difficulty lies in finding a definition which will cover a majority of the varied uses of the term Suggestion and yet be fairly exact. This can be done. An examination of definitions adopted by the principal writers on Suggestion—this list includes Winans, Woolbert, Scott, Thorndike, Sidis, Hollingworth, Boudouin, Ross, Macpherson, Judd, Keatinge, LeBon, McDougal, Clark, and others—will show that there is one element common in all the

many types of Suggestion. Perhaps the best wording of this common element has been given by Winans. He says that "when we act upon a prompting external to ourselves, and without deliberation, we act upon suggestion." Closely allied to this definition is that given by Hollingworth—"The uncritical acceptance of a notion, usually with the implication that the suggested individual is unaware that his ideas have been affected."

In nearly every definition of Suggestion this uncritical acceptance of an idea is either expressed or implied. Unless some more fundamental element can be discovered, the student is safe in adopting this conception as a starting point.

Once having made a beginning, we find that the seemingly hopeless field of contending definitions becomes more orderly. Excluding from this present paper all methods of indirect Suggestion (by means of which the audience is led to accept a view before it is actually stated by the speaker), we are confronted by two conflicting methods of securing effective Suggestion.

The first method is largely that of imitation. The public speaker expresses a sentiment which moves a number of the audience. In various ways, the affected members consciously or unconsciously communicate their reactions to the remainder of the crowd. Like a yawn, the reaction spreads. Soon nearly everyone present is affected. The entire audience laughs, or cries, or is enraged, or is depressed.

In direct contrast to this method is that using complete fixation of attention. Professor Woolbert in one of his psychological monographs has shown in detail the working of this method. The speaker first gains the complete attention of every member in the crowd. Each man listens, almost hypnotised. The inhibitions of his daily life drop away. He accepts every statement; he does not think; he forgets the man at his side and what that man will think of him; his primal mind or self is open to every suggestion of fear, hate, revenge, love, indignation.

Obviously, the use of these two types requires markedly different techniques. In one, the speaker makes every effort to move the more susceptible members of the audience, knowing that their reactions will in turn make more susceptible the rest of the audience. Any devices causing applause, laughter, cheering, weeping,

resentment against an opponent, or other visible or audible reactions will here be affective. But these same devices would break the "spell" and thus be very much out of place in the other method calling for complete fixation of attention. Here the problem is largely that of polarization, of gaining and holding an undivided attention. If the speaker reminds any member of the audience of the man seated next to him or of that man's reactions, the speaker may lose the undivided attention which he has labored so long to gain. With this method, a quiet, motionless audience is the only external sign of success.

Which of the two methods the speaker should use will depend upon the aim of the speech, the possibilities of finding material for either type of Suggestion, and the attitude of the audience. The two methods may even be combined in one speech. The efforts of Mark Antony to gain complete attention at the beginning of his most famous speech are in marked contrast with the self-excitation which he caused the mob to work later in the oration. The speeches of Wendell Phillips also show an unusual mastery of both techniques.

The average speaker, however, is not so successful. The two methods are often hopelessly mixed ten or twelve times in the same talk. Much confusion results. And a considerable part of the blame can be laid to the text-books dealing with various forms of Suggestion. These books often discuss Suggestion without defining exactly what the term means or analyzing the subject to determine its subdivisions. Indeed, many teachers of speech and many psychologists seem unaware that Suggestion is not a simple, single element. Nor do they trouble to show how their definitions or general conceptions of the term differ from the twenty or more variations in definition used by other writers. As a result, the student either concludes that Suggestion is a vague term covering almost everything, or drops his investigation in disgust and confines himself to "argumentation" and "persuasion," thereby limiting the scope of his speaking technique.

Nor is that all. Many writers and teachers advocate the use of methods containing Suggestion without even mentioning the word. Elements of Suggestion are found in the use of attention—holding specific illustrations, vivid imagery, appeals to the emotion, pausing

for the effect, creating a psychological crowd, the appearance of the speaker, introductions by the chairman, advance notices of meetings, the stage setting and the lighting of the auditorium, humor, use of authority, quality of the voice, and a long parade of others. We give the student twenty or forty or fifty devices which he may use. Many times there is no attempt at classification. Or the classification is solely arbitrary—"Fifteen qualities of a good speaker" or "Ten ways of gaining attention." Twelve ways are given for the formation of a "psychological crowd." The teacher fails to point out that the inducing of an audience to sing "America" will destroy that atmosphere of hushed expectancy which the first three methods listed aim to create. He neglects to explain that the use of all twelve methods will either empty the hall or drive the audience to the verge of hysteria! Can we wonder that the student is bewildered, that he so often discards all our devices almost as soon as he leaves the class-room, and reverts to type, saying what he has to say in the most blunt, ineffective way possible?

Where in the field of public speaking and rhetoric is there greater confusion? There is an urgent need for a detailed treatment of the two major types of Suggestion. Perhaps a much better division may be found than the division advanced in this paper. Certainly we are much in need of a careful exposition of the many appeals which may be used with each type. The difficult technique of Indirect Suggestion also needs a more thorough analysis than it has hitherto received. Suggestion still remains a fertile field for research.

THRASYMACHUS: A PIONEER RHETORICIAN

BROMLEY SMITH

My name is Theta, ro, alpha, san,
Upsilon, mu, alpha, chi, ou, san again:
Chalcedon my natal town; wise I was in rhetoric art.[1]

Such was the inscription engraved upon the tomb of Thrasymachus, the sophist of Chalcedon. Below the marble lay the remains of one of those pioneers of rhetoric who adorned the fifth

[1] Athenaeus, 10.81.

century before Christ. This man was accredited by the ancients with the discovery of periods, clauses, and tropes; with the invention of the middle style of speech; with the primary observation that good prose was rhythmical; and with the publication of the first text on Elocution. He was one of those early promoters mentioned by Aristotle, men who gave a pedagogy to rhetoric: Tisias, Thrasymachus, and Theodorus being named as outstanding authors.[2]

Of the man himself very little is known. He came from Chalcedon, a village not far from "windy Troy," looking across the waters toward the future city of Constantine. Happening to be born about 457 B. C., he became part of that intellectual wave which bore upon its crest Gorgias, Protagoras, and others of a brilliant group of rhetoricians. We first meet him in the Platonic dialogues as one of those itinerant teachers who peddled wisdom for pay, like Prodicus, Hippias, and others whom Plato despised. The philosopher put him in the *Republic* as a foil for Socrates, making him a testy fellow, shallow and belligerent. That reputation for pugnacity survived in the pages of Aristotle, for Herodikos of Selymbria in punning fashion said, "You are just like your name, always bold in battle." In modern parlance this would mean that he was an excellent scrapper, because his name was "Bearcat;" for Thrasymachus, when split, is equivalent to "Bold-Fighter."[3]

Let us be on our guard, however, lest the delineation of this rhetorician be another one of those caricatures that adorn the pages of Plato. When we strip the epithets and examine the circumstances, we find a man defending an idea, an idea that is offensive to the great philosopher. This pigmy dares to stand before Socrates and argue that justice is nothing else than the interest of the stronger, that the dominant power tyrannizes over the minority for its own benefit. Plato, dreaming of his ideal republic, governed by philosophers, could not understand the practical man, the one who looked at the world that is, not toward the world that ought to be. This real, everyday world, Thrasymachus conceived to be governed by despots, oligarchs, or democratic majorities. The party in power demanded obedience to its will. Those who refused to obey

[2] Aristotle, Soph. El. 34. 183. 29.
[3] Aristotle, Rhet. 2. 23. 29.

were haled into court, immured in dungeons, ostracized, or executed. The abstract idea of personal liberty, of individual privilege, had no place in a strong government; although occasionally mercy might "season justice" Thrasymachus saw clearly that this was not the general usage of humanity. As a teacher in a Greek commonwealth, he would show his pupils how men were persuaded to adopt certain policies which seemed at the time desirable. Incidentally, then, he could insert his philosophic notion, that the ruling party would naturally demand obedience to the adopted policies; it would administer *justice* in its own interest.[4]

Now such an obvious notion could never give Thrasymachus a lofty place among the philosophers; he must content himself with a niche among them allotted by the historians of philosophy. His real claim to distinction lies in his own field. Herein he added a touch of originality to the commonplaces taught by other rhetoricians,[5] in that he insisted upon excellence of delivery. Plainly, he could not have been the only teacher to recognize the importance of voice and gesture, but he took a step which made these elements noticeable, for he wrote the first text on Elocution.[6] According to Aristotle, who was well acquainted with the history of rhetoric, "No systematic treatise upon the rules of delivery had been composed. . . . . Only very slight attempts to deal with the principles had been made and by a few people, as by Thrasymachus in his *Appeals to Pity.*" What was meant by *Appeals to Pity?* What was their connection with delivery? Aristotle earlier in his Rhetoric had defined pity as a "feeling of pain caused by the sight of some evil, destructive or painful, which befalls one who does not deserve it, and which we might expect to befall ourselves or some friend of ours, and moreover, befall us soon." Self-interest governs this feeling, for "the general principle is, that what we fear for ourselves excites our pity when it happens to others." Then he showed the relation of the orator to pity by stating "that those

[4] Plato, *Republic*, I. 336-354, 338.

[5] Quin., *Inst. Orat.* III. 1. 12.

[6] The term as used here is not the ancient *Elocutio*, for that was a phase of oratory dealing with style or diction, but the ancient *Pronuntiatio*, the *Hypocrisis* of the Greeks, sometimes called *Actio* by the Romans.

[7] Ar. *Rhet.* III. 1. 5. 7.

who heighten the effect of their words with suitable *gestures, tones, dress,* and *dramatic action* generally are especially successful in exciting pity; they thus put the disasters before our eyes, and make them seem close to us, just coming or just past."[8]

Would it be possible to teach pupils to use gestures, tones, and dramatic action? Aristotle stated that up to his day (384-322 B. C.) "the subject had been neglected." He gave his own views in a general way concerning expression. It was a matter of the right management of the voice to express the various emotions: of speaking loudly, softly, or between the two; of high, low, or intermediate pitch; of the various rhythms that suit various subjects. These are the three things—volume of sound, modulation of pitch, and rhythm—that a speaker bears in mind."[9] In reading this description of delivery, one notes that the voice is the important element. Nothing is said about gestures or dramatic action, although they had been mentioned previously in connection with Pity; nor is any pedagogy of the subject attempted. When Thrasymachus wrote his Eleoi, or Piteous Appeals, perhaps a hundred years before, he must have had in mind some or all of these elements, else how could he expect to awaken pity? In the absence of direct testimony from his book, we are compelled to fall back upon circumstantial evidence to determine the drift of this first work on Elocution.

Before making the investigation, however, the development of *Appeals to Pity* by rhetoricians demands some attention. Turning first to the practical treatise, commonly called the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum,* we find that the arousing of Pity was already recognized as part of an orator's training. The unknown author touches the subject in several places:—

> "We shall have no difficulty in arousing as much pity as we wish, if we realize that all men pity those whom they suppose to be closely connected with themselves or think to be unworthy to suffer misfortune. You must prove that this is the condition of those for whom you wish to excite pity, or will be so unless your hearers assist them. Etc."
>
> Further, we must "show that a close tie binds us to our hearers and that we are suffering undeserved misfortune, having

[8] *Rhet.* II. 8. Here Aristotle discusses Pity in full. In 14 the action of the orators is portrayed.

[9] Ar. *Rhet.*, 3. 1. 4.

been unfairly treated in the past, or being likely to be so in the future, unless they help us now. Etc."[10]

How important the Greeks considered the matter of exciting Pity in the minds of men may be inferred from the fact that they even erected an altar to the goddess of Pity.[11] Their attitude was reflected by the Romans, especially by the author of the treatise written for Herennius. As a practical teacher he defined the term and gave illustrative details. "*Conquestio,*" said he, "is a speech which leads the mind of the auditor to pity by amplifying misfortunes." He believed that it should be used in conclusions.[12] The best exposition, however, was given by Cicero in the last chapter of the first book of the *de Inventione.* He set down sixteen topics which an orator might use to awaken pity in the minds of men. In the first topic "we show how great the prosperity of our clients was, and how great their present misery is." In other topics he mentions parents, children, old age, and misfortunes of many kinds. In the eighth topic he quoted the exact words of an orator who speaks of something which ought not to have been done: "I was not present, I did not see him, I did not hear his last words, I did not receive his last breath. Moreover, he died amid his enemies, he lay shamefully unburied in an enemy's country, being torn to pieces by wild beasts, and was deprived in death of even that honor which is due to all men."

Cicero was not averse to using artfulness in arousing pity, for in the *Orator* he admitted that "we have been in the habit of using that topic ourselves in so piteous a manner that we have even held an infant child by the hand while summing up; and in another cause, we lifted up the little son of a man of noble birth who was on trial, and filled the forum with wailing and lamentations."[13] Cicero's final advice is this: "When men's minds are moved, it will not be right to dwell longer on complaints; for, as Apollonius the rhetorician said, 'Nothing dries quicker than a tear.'"

The seeds of Pity, sown in the soil of rhetoric by the Greeks

[10] *Rhet. ad Alex.* 1439b 17ff; 1440a 40; 1443b 17; 1445a. E. S. Forster, tr.

[11] For a digested account of the importance of Pity in Greek life see the *Realencyclopedia* of Pauly-Wissowa.

[12] *Auct. ad Her.* III. 13; II. 30. 31; IV. 39.

[13] Cic. *Orator,* 37-38.

and Romans did not lie dormant during the Middle Ages. They still displayed vitality when the rhetoricians of the Renaissance gave instruction. Thomas Wilson, for instance, penning his *Arte of Rhetorique*, in 1553, inserted a paragraph headed, "Of moving pittie, and stirring men to shewe mercie."

> "Likewise, we may exhorte men to take pitie of the fatherlesse, the widowe, & the oppressed innocent, if we set before their eyes, the lamentable afflictions, the tyrannous wrongs, and the miserable calamities, which these poore wretches doe sustaine. For if flesh and bloud move us to love our children, our wives, and our kinfolke: much more should the spirite of God, and Christes goodnesse towardes man, stiree us to love our neighbours most intierly. These exhortations the preachers of God may most aptly use, when they open his Gospel to the people, & have just cause to speake of such matters."[14]

Up to Wilson's time and for years after, the attention of writers seemed to be directed toward topics and explanations, with a little general advice as to delivery, such as setting calamities, wrongs, and afflictions "before the eyes." In the eighteenth century, however, a school of Elocutionists arose which sought to systematize expression by the voice and by the body. Their influence extended into the nineteenth century, when William Russell, inspired by Dr. James Rush, author of *The Philosophy of the Human Voice*, composed a work on *Orthophony or Vocal Culture*, in which he stated that Pity and Tenderness could be produced by the use of "Pure Tone, Subdued Force, Median and Vanishing Stress, High Pitch, Semitone Proper, and Chromatic Fifth, throughout."[15] In like manner, Fulton and Trueblood stated that the *Semitone* predominates in pity, and that *Chromatic Melody* is used in the expression of plaintiveness, tenderness, pity, pathos, and grief.[16] Waiving all of these technical terms, A. E. Phillips advanced the theory that the expression of emotions is natural, requiring only drills on colloquial and classical passages to develop a proper interpretation by the voice. In his work on *Effective Speaking*, Phillips inserts a topic on Pity which the student is supposed to expand from the standpoint of content, nothing being said about delivery,

[14] Wilson, *Arte of Rhetorique*, ed. G. H. Mair, p. 65.
[15] W. Russell, Orthophony, p. 175. (1886).
[16] Fulton and Trueblook, *Practical Elements of Elocution*, p. 238, 266.

as "The poor have many sorrows."[17] These brief references, ancient and modern, merely show that the emotion of Pity, first treated by Thrasymachus, has always attracted the serious attention of teachers of oratory. Naturally, teachers of speech would like to know whether Thrasymachus approached the problem from the standpoint of content, or from that of delivery. It is probable that he issued a collection of commonplaces like those of Cicero's *de Inventione,* although no evidence of this has survived. But if such were the case, the topics must have been subordinated to delivery, for that is the phase which attracted the attention of the ancient authorities. As already stated, Aristotle connected him with Hypocrisis, or Elocution, while Quintilian averred that he held the same views as many other rhetoricians "in regard to delivery."[18]

As to the kind of delivery, we have the sarcastic testimony of Plato, who represents the Chalcedonian as a speaker who played upon the emotions, Socrates thus describes his power: "For tearful speeches, to arouse pity for old age and poverty, I think the precepts of the giant of Chalcedon hold the palm. As he said, he can put a whole company into a passion and sooth them again when they are angry, and he is especially powerful at inventing or disposing of any sort of calumny on any grounds whatsoever."[19]

Although Socrates mocks Thrasymachus, he nevertheless admits that he is a skilful speaker. "I should like to know," he says, "whether this may not be the famous art of rhetoric which Thrasymachus and others teach and practice themselves? Skilful speakers they are and they impart their skill to any who are willing to make kings of them and to bring gifts to them." "Yes," replied Phaedrus, "they are royal men: but not learned in the things about which you are inquiring. I think you rightly speak of this as dialectic."[20] From this fragment of dialogue, we may infer that this "royal man" was weak in logical power, but able to deliver a

[17] A. E. Phillips, *Natural Drills in Expression,* p. 54. *Effective Speaking,* p. 238.

[18] Quint. *Inst. Orat.* III. 3. 4. quoniam memoria atque actio natura non arte contingant. . . .licet Thrasymachus quoque idem de actione crediderit.

[19] *Phaedrus,* 267C.

[20] Ibid, 266.

strong speech of the emotional type. As the essence of Pity is emotion, not logic, and as Plato, Aristotle, and Quintilian connect Thrasymachus with delivery, we may safely infer that his text on *Piteous Appeals* contained rules for producing pathos.

Of course, emotion alone would not give permanent fame to a speaker, for voice and gesture and dramatic action are ephemeral. What then did Thrasymachus possess that was worthy of imitation or even of criticism? We find at this point that he accompanied his dramatic delivery by an excellent literary style. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing his famous critiques on Lysias and Demosthenes, observed that Thrasymachus was the first to employ a style of speaking that was neither austere nor simple, but a mixture of the two. It was distinguished by compression of thought and neatness of finish; it was rounded and terse.[21] This middle style was so well adapted to speaking and writing that Isocrates and Plato perfected it, while Demosthenes found in it the medium for his best expression. Thrasymachus himself employed the style he had discovered, in the preparation of speeches of a professional character, and epideictic addresses. These, says Dionysius, were composed in a pure, refined, powerful, yet compact and elegant manner.[22] Certainly these opinions by the greatest critic of antiquity indicate that literary merit can accompany emotional delivery. In these judgments Dionysius was supported by Cicero, who stated that "Thrasymachus of Chalcedon and Gorgias of Leontini were the first men who taught the science of delighting the ears."[23] Cicero then added that Isocrates thought Thrasymachus too concise with his closely measured rhythm, and Gorgais also, though they were the first to lay down any rules at all for the harmony of sentences.[24] Later, in the same treatise, the *Orator*, he asserted that Isocrates composed rhythmic prose to give pleasure, "but the original inventor of rhythm was Thrasymachus, all of whose writ-

[21] Dion. Hal, *Dem.* 3. Ibid, *Lysias*, 6.

[22] Dion. Hal, *Isaeus*, 20.

[23] Cic., *Orator*, XII. 39, ad voluptatem aurium. . . . haec tractasse Thrasymachum Calchedonium primum et Leontinum ferunt Gorgiam.

[24] Cic., *Orator*, XIII. Nam quum concisus ei Thrasymachus minutis numeris videtur et Gorgias, qui tamen primi traduntur arte quadam verba vinxisse.

ings are even too carefully rhythmical."[25] By two excellent authorities we are therefore assured that out of Chalcedon there had come a rhetorician who was able to charm by his literary, as well as by his elocutionary, style.

Unfortunately, we cannot use our independent judgment as to the merits of the middle styles as employed by Thrasymachus, for none of his logographic or epideictic addresses have come down to us. Only a few fragments have survived. Among these is a passage of no value, quoted by Dionysius, which bears the earmarks of a school exercise.[26] Aristotle credits him with using a simile, when he jokingly asserted that Nikeratos resembled a Philoktetes stung by Pratys: meaning that the longhaired and dirty Nikeratos had been defeated in a rhapsodic contest by Pratys, even as the squalid hermit Philoktetes had been bitten by a serpent.[27] One sentence from a speech in behalf of the Larisians attracted the attention of Clement of Alexandria: "Shall we who are Greeks be slaves to Archelaus the barbarian?"[28] Nevertheless, in spite of the scantiness of the gleanings, we know that Thrasymachus was an author whose work had made an impression on the ancients. On the authority of Cicero we learn that he wrote much on natural philosophy.[29] Julius the Sophist made a selection from his works. Hermias, the Alexandrian commentator on Plato's Phaedrus, referred to what Thrasymachus had written in one of his speeches. Athenaeus gave an extract from one of his "Prefaces."[30] A scholiast on Aristophanes' *Birds* mentioned his rhetorical treatise.[31] Plutarch had seen his work on *Illustrious Men*.[32] Plato and Aristotle had read his *Appeals to Pity*. Dionysius said his art was

[25] Cic., *Orator*, LII. sed princeps inveniendi fuit Thrasymachus, cuius nimis etiam exstant scripta numerose.

[26] Dion., *Dem.* 3.

[27] Ar., *Rhet.* 3. 11. 13.
Homer, *Illiad*, 11. 721.

[28] Clem. *Strom.* VI. 16.

[29] Cic. *De Orat.* III. 32. Thrasymachus de natura rerum et disseruit et scripsit.

[30] Suidas.
Hermias, p. 239, 21.
Athenaeus, 10. 9.

[31] Schol. Arist. *Birds.* 880.

[32] Plutarch, *quaest. conv.* 1. 2. 3.

visible in his "professional writings and his epideictic speeches; that he did not leave behind any judicial or deliberative address."[33] Finally, Suidas noted that he wrote deliberative addresses, a treatise on rhetoric, sportive poems, and rhetorical starting points. From these notes on authorship, one gains the impression that Thrasymachus was not only devoted to the pedagogy of rhetoric, but was also able to apply its principles. He may not have had the catholicity of interest displayed by Protagoras, Prodicus, and Hippias; nevertheless, he made contributions to the art of which he was master, contributions which attracted the attention of the best minds among the philosophers and critics of antiquity.

One of the contributions mentioned by Suidas dealt with *aphormae,* or rhetorical starting points. What were they? We gain no information from the author; hence we must again seek elsewhere. Fortunately, Longinus the rhetorician gives full details, from which we discover that speakers need material or hints that will stimulate thought, awaken imagination, and test the orator's knowledge of a subject. These aids to invention, he says, may be drawn from "the fortunes of humanity, their occupations, ages, families, riches, manners, characters, reputation (good and bad), actions, inertness, and other things of like character; further, with regard to affairs the customs, associations, isolations, residence with others, similarity and difference, identity with other things, what things are, in what they are, whence the beginnings and endings, what the causes, what the necessities, evident and hidden causes, and whatsover one may discover. . . . . By means of these instruments, the so-called proofs and materials (aphormae) arouse a great abundance of talk."[34]

An inspection of these sources of inspiration will convince the reader that the field of human activity is well covered. Such sources might be valuable to a young orator, one who lacked the incentives of a real case or occasion. They furnished the leads, the topics, the starting points of the inventive process. Thrasymachus seems to

[33] Dion, Hal, *Isaeus*, 20.

[34] Walz, *Rhet. Gr.* 9:554. *Longinus on Invention.*

have been the first teacher of rhetoric to organize a collection of such sources.[35]

Just before mentioning the treatise on materials, sources, or starting points, Suidas noted that the Chalcedonian was the discoverer of the period and clause, and the introducer of the rhetorical trope. What can be said of such a list of discoveries? Had not orators and writers always used periods and clauses? Had they not embellished their productions with figurative expressions? Surely, no one would deny the presence of these common elements of style. Yet no one had been keen enough to examine the groups of words, to dissect them, and to give names and definitions. Thrasymachus is given the credit for detecting these elements, Aristotle had probably seen an account of them in his treatise on rhetoric, or some other work, and was lead to describe the period in his own fashion. It is unfortunate that we do not have Thrasymachus' own account of the period, and the illustrations he must have given.

When we turn to the trope, we are no better off. Suidas simply says that the Chalcedonian recognized or introduced tropes. In doing so, he may be considered responsible for those interminable disputes among grammarians as to what tropes are, how many there are, whether some are subordinate to others, and whether they can be distinguished from figures. Little did he know that the youth of the civilized world would be compelled to detect and compose Antonomasias, Catachreses, and Metalepses. In his day, Synecdoche, Metonymy, Hyberbaton, and Hyperbole were unknown. Within a few centuries, however, the brains of students were to be tortured by Dissimulationes and Prosopopoeias; Apasiopeses and Paradiastoles; Homoeoteleuton, Paronomasia, and Synezeugmenon. Nor were these students confined to Greece, for the rhetoricians and grammarians taught the growing youth in all parts of the Roman Empire. Some of these teachers were not satisfied with the Greek

[35] For additional information on material, see the rhetorical works of Meander and Lucianus in Walz' *Rhetores Graeci*. The modern counterpart may be found in Phillip's *Effective Speaking*, p. 204, where the speaker asks himself such questions as What? How? Where? When? Who? Origin? Nature? Functions? etc. More exhaustively, such questions as Spiritually? Morally? Intellectually? Physically? Historically? and many more. By asking these questions, the speaker discovers his own knowledge and deficiencies, and starts trains of thought.

names for the figures and tropes, hence they invented new names in Latin. Equipped with a double nomenclature, the study of tropes and figures swept on its triumphant way across the Alps, down the Rhine, and over into Britain and Ireland. In vain Bede and others attempted to simplify Priscian and Donatus; the names remained. *Anadiplosis,* he told his very dear children (dilectissime fili), was called in Latin *Replicatio; Zeugma* was *Conjunctio.* The "Venerable" never seemed to have thought about Anglicising the terms. Centuries later Puttenham undertook the task, with weird results. *Repetitio* became *Cuckoo-spel. Hyperbole* was *magically* changed into *Loud-Lier. Soraismus* was ingeniously turned into the euphonious *Mingle Mangle.* The school masters, however, refused to accept the new jargon. They continued to use the old terms until late in the Nineteenth Century. Then came a revolution in the pedagogy of rhetoric, so drastic, that today students of grammar and composition, public speaking and literature, know the names of barely half a dozen of the ancient terms. Indeed, the world of expression has returned to that primitive condition which must have existed before Thrasymachus introduced tropes into the pedagogy of rhetoric.

One more discovery must be added to the list, one that was regarded by the ancient orators and critics as extremely important. The Chalcedonian, being, as already stated, an Elocutionist, sought for the secret of a good style, a style that would deliver well. He found it in prose rhythm. Now prose rhythm has been a will-o'-the-wisp which the speakers of all ages have pursued. Just as they were penning it in, a loop hole would be found through which it escaped. The rules for poetry—that is, metric rhythm—were established satisfactorily, but no definite rules could be set down for prose rhythm. They felt its swing when under the spell of a mighty orator; they detected its presence by an inner voice on the written page; but they could not throw a net over it. Thrasymachus was the first of the searchers into the mysteries of prose style. He thought he had found the solution when he noted that the insertion of paeans into his periods gave a distinct rhythmic effect. Aristotle gave him the credit for the discovery, although he subtracted from the glory by remarking that he did not know what it was that he had discovered. Then the Stagirite comes to the rescue. "Prose,"

says he, "must have rhythm, but not metre; for then it would be poetry. This rhythm, however, must not be precise. . . . . One kind of rhythm is the heroic; this is grand and remote from the measure of conversation. The iambic is the cadence of common talk . . . . while the trochee is too much akin to the comic dance . . . it has a tripping rhythm. There remains the paean, which rhetoricians began to use from the time of Thrasymachus."

Aristotle then explains the paean as a rhythm which consisted of three short syllables and a long one, or a long syllable followed by three shorts. It did not attract attention to its metrical nature like the iambic, trochaic, and other metres. Used at the beginning of a sentence it should consist of the long syllable followed by the shorts; used at the end of the period it should consist of three shorts and a long, because that would give the effect of completeness of the rhythm. If the speaker ended with a short syllable, the sentence would be left in the air, so to speak.[37]

That the ancient orators and writers really used paeans may be proved by an inspection of the *Panegyric* and *Trapezitus* of Isocrates. To English auditors, however, they mean very little, for our language is accentual rather than quantitative. We do, of course, recognize the cadence of a conclusion and we do change the tempo, but the deliberate insertion of a paean or any other metre does not appeal to us. The discovery of Thrasymachus, accordingly, does not mean as much to us as it did to the Greeks; it does mean, however, that a rhetorician had attempted to ferret out the rhythm of prose. From his day men have deliberately sought to charm by a careful choice of words and by a careful attention to the swing of sentences and even paragraphs. Those who read the orations of Webster and Macaulay aloud will bear witness that the power of these masters is due in part to the rhythm of their prose. This quality of prose style, so elusive, so delightful to the ear, was first analyzed and taught centuries ago by a wandering Greek rhetorician.

Of him we cannot say that his philosophy led to the burning of his books, as was the case with Protagoras; or to the poison cup,

[37] Ar., *Rhet.* III. 8. 4. Examples of the paean at the beginning and end. Unfortunately the examples given by Aristotle are taken from the *Paeans* of Simonides, hence they are of little value as illustrations of prose rhythm.

as was the fate of Socrates; but, nevertheless, his end was pathetic. Let Juvenal sing his requiem. The great satirist had been relating the high rewards of rhetoric to men like Quintilian, but, continued he, "Many a man has repented of this fruitless and barren employment, as the sad end of Thrasymachus proves." In the margin of the manuscript some scholiast had written, "rhetoris apud Athenas qui suspendio perit—Of the orator at Athens who perished by hanging."[38] We know not the reason for his suicide, whether it was ill-health or loss of patronage. If we could erect another monument in his honor, we might place upon its sides more than his name, his birthplace, and his trade. We might call the attention of the passer-by to a pioneer in the pedagogy of rhetoric, one who noted the rhythm of prose, who invented a phase of style, and who was the Father of Elocution.

[38] Juvenal, VII. 203. Paenituit multos vanae sterilisque cathedrae sicut Thrasymachi probat exitus.

SOME PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS OF PHONETICS IN THE TEACHING OF SPEECH*

ELIZABETH AVERY
Smith College

In the preface to Will Durant's *Story of Philosophy*—that famous preface which all of us have read, whether or not we have penetrated very far into the book itself—this statement occurs:

> Science is analytical description, philosophy is synthetic interpretation. Science wishes to resolve the whole into parts, the organism into organs, the obscure into the known. It does not inquire into the values and ideal possibilities of things, nor into their total and final significance; it is content to show their present actuality and operation, it narrows its gaze resolutely to the nature and process of things as they are. The philosopher is not content to describe the fact; he wishes to ascertain its relation to experience in general, and thereby to get at its meaning and its worth; he combines things in interpretative synthesis; he tries to put together, better than before, that great universe-watch which the inquisitive scientist has analytically taken apart. To observe processes and to construct means is science;

* Read at the Chicago Convention, December 29, 1926.

> to criticize and co-ordinate ends is philosophy: and because in these days our means and instruments have multiplied beyond our interpretation and synthesis of ideals and ends, our life is full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. For a fact is nothing except in relation to desire; it is not complete except in relation to a purpose and a whole. Science without philosophy, facts without perspective and valuation, cannot save us from havoc and despair. Science gives us knowledge, but only philosophy can give us wisdom.

In looking back over the history of speech training in this country, one is inclined to wonder if some of our failures and half successes have not been due to the fact that in the past most of us have either lacked a philosophy of the subject or else have formulated one without the ardors and endurances of an adequate analysis. For this reason the rapidly growing interest in the bones of the subject—whether dry or not according to one's taste in bones—has seemed the most hopeful feature of our whole history. Researches into the physiology, psychology, physics, as well as the history, logic, ethics, and aesthetics of speech, are gradually giving to us a reason for the faith that is in us, and to our subject an honorable name and place in the educational world.

It is the practical application of phonetics in speech training that I shall discuss and, if I seem to neglect other phases of the subject, it is not because I fail to see the importance of the larger synthesis but because I feel that any satisfactory interpretation of ideals and ends in our teaching must be preceded by "a resolute narrowing of our gaze to the process of things as they are."

One of the most immediately practical results of a phonetic equipment is that it greatly increases the respect felt for the subject by students, teachers, and lay public, and gives it a professional standing such as it did not and could not command in the old days when any bright boy with a debate or two and perhaps an oratorical contest to his credit, or any temperamental girl who had acted in a school play or recited a chapter from *Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm* could, with little if any further training, qualify as a teacher of speech.

Any one who has tried to equip himself to use the phonetic method adequately, knows that it implies not only a very solid body of theory, including the laws of phonetic change and the phonetic

bases of foreign languages, but a long and vigorous training of the vocal organs. Such an equipment in a teacher of speech commands the same sort of respect as does a knowledge of mathematics in a teacher of physics. And the time is fast approaching when it will be considered as presumptuous to attempt to teach pronunciation without knowledge of the phonetic bases of the language as to teach music if one plays only by ear.

As a result of his training, the phonetician can give simple and clear instructions, instead of the jargon which in the past has filled text books on voice and speech.

In addition to creating greater respect for the subject, phonetic teaching commends itself as being pedagogically sound, since it recognizes that the period of successful imitation has passed before college or even high-school age, and uses a method which depends on logical analysis and on the use of three carefully trained senses—sight, hearing, and the kinaesthetic sense—instead of relying entirely on the untrained ear.

Thus taught, moreover, Spoken English becomes a definitely cultural study, since it trains the student to hear his own sounds accurately and compare them with those of others, so that his speech becomes a matter of free and intelligent choice, instead of servile dependence on a dictionary or a teacher. It is a matter of common observation that, until our ears have been trained, it is impossible to hear how we sound to others.

If a student has carefully analyzed the whole body of his speech sounds, and decided which he wishes to change, and if he has trained his vocal organs to make the new sounds accurately and to incorporate them easily and naturally in his speech, there is little danger of his seeming affected. His speech has become the closely-woven and perfectly fitting garment of his thought—not, as so often happens from the imitative method, a shabby, second-hand affair, adorned with a few bright patches laid on at random. In so important a matter, then, as his means of communication with his fellows, he has attained to that mental autonomy which is one of the great ends and criteria of culture.

It follows that from the phonetic way of looking at language, not as inert matter to be pressed into a fixed mold, but as a living, ever-changing organism, its study becomes a delightful adventure,

so that even the hard training ceases to be a drudgery, and the results are quicker and more lasting.

Many teachers, however, who feel that this method is the only satisfactory way of teaching speech, in the narrower sense of the word, deny its usefulness in voice training. This attitude suggests the naiveté of M. Jourdain in his discovery that his every-day speech was prose. What is speech, if not voice given certain resonances by the shaping of the vowels and consonants? And how could these changes of resonance help affecting the voice? The failure of both phoneticians and voice teachers to see this interdependence is doubtless one of the causes of the slowness with which the phonetic method has gained ground.

There is time to suggest only a few cases in which the correction of speech sounds practically corrects faults of voice.

First, in the matter of nasality. In the past, many voice teachers were ignorant of the fact that one of the chief causes of nasality is the improper functioning of the soft palate; those who were not, feared that such knowledge on the part of the student would make him self-conscious. Instead, therefore, of frankly telling him the condition and the cure, they tried to correct his nasality by such appeals to his imagination as "Speak as if you had a hot potato in your mouth," or "Talk as if you were sending your voice right through the top of your head." Such methods did, no doubt, get results with a certain type of imaginatively suggestible student; on the other hand, they certainly made the judicious grieve. Most college students work with more zeal and intelligence when told that a vowel or a consonant made with lowered soft palate is a nasal sound and that, since there are only three legitimate nasals in the English language, they must learn to counteract the perfectly natural tendency to allow the palate to remain low in speech as it does in quiet breathing. If they then observe the action of the soft palate in a mirror, and learn to feel the difference between a raised and lowered velum, and to hear the difference in sounds formed with the velum in the high and in the low position, they have made a start in the right direction.

At this stage, it is useful to give passages without nasals for practice, as for instance, "There abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." When the student has learned to maintain the velum in this high position without strain,

the next step is to acquire the ability to raise and lower it with ease and lightning speed in going from nasal to oral sounds. To accomplish this, the teacher may give any of the exercises for the cure of nasality—alternating the velar nasal and *a* or the oral and the nasal *a*, with increasing rapidity, or the *t*ai-*t*ai-*t*ai-*t*aim, *t*ai-tai-*t*ai-tai-*t*ai-tai-*t*aim exercise. Another excellent exercise is the old zu-z*a*-zu-z*a*-zu-z*a*-zu-a-ei-i-ou-u, said or sung on the notes do, mi, do, mi, do, mi, do; do, re, mi, fa, sol. Even the hot-potato or the top-of-the-head method might safely be used, once the student had understood clearly what it was intended to accomplish.

Facility in the control of the soft palate once gained, the student should begin to make use of this control in reading and speaking. Many teachers like to use poetry at this stage, as the desire to give adequate expression to the beauty of the passage often acts as spur to the will in the matter of practice. Since the vowels most often nasalized are those in the words *mine, name, man,* and *found;* passages containing several of these are specially helpful, as, for instance,

"Time, you old Gypsy Man,
Will you not stay?
Put up your caravan
Just for one day?"

The last and most important step, of course, is to carry over into daily speech this dexterity in the control of the velum. That done, the problem of nasality is well on its way toward solution. Undue tension of the throat and tongue also contribute to the total effect which is called nasality. The cure of these is, of course, another story.

Closely connected with the flabby or the rigid condition of the soft palate, is the flabbiness or the rigidity of the lips and tongue in making plosives. The tense condition which is sometimes observable in the speech of over-energetic or over-conscientious speakers, gives a labored and grinding character to the speech and an unresonant quality to the voice.

The over-relaxed condition is much more common in America. This slack closure often gives to breathed plosives the effect of their voiced cognates, so that *breeches* sounds like *bridges, neat* like *need,* etc. Sometimes the closure is so slackly made that the plosive

has a fricative quality, as in Bowery speech, "He saidθ thatθ thatθ was thatθ." The third and last stage of such slack articulation occurs when the closure is not made in the mouth at all but at the vocal cords, causing (in its acute form) "Glottal Goity" speech. This habit, as every phonetician knows, is not confined to East Side New York and the London and Scotch slums, but is heard in every part of our country and in practically every social stratum. Especially does it prevail when the plosive is final or followed by m or w, as in "all right," "department," "What was it?"

Now this would seem to be exclusively a speech problem, but nothing could be farther from the case. The feebleness of the mouth muscles in forming plosives is of a piece with the slackness of the soft palate—is, in fact, closely related to the problem of nasality—and the attempt to use the tongue and lips more smartly communicates a certain briskness to the velum. Exercises for firm closure and quick release of plosives are therefore of the greatest help in overcoming nasality.

Besides, the firm and forward articulation of the postdentals t and d is of great help in focussing the tone in the front of the mouth and avoiding that backward production which is a frequent cause of unpleasant and ineffective voices.

And lastly, any training which enables us to avoid the glottal shock helps to reduce the tense shrillness which is so common a fault, especially in feminine voices.

This question of the postdental plosives brings us to another point at which voice and speech training meet—that of inversion (the turning back of the tongue tip toward the hard palate in forming the postdentals t, d, n, l, r, s, z, ʃ, ʒ, and their adjacent vowels.) The natural position for the tip of the tongue is behind the lower front teeth in all vowels and in all consonants except the dentals and postdentals. The curling back of the tongue is an articulation which probably can be, but in America seldom is, achieved without tension at the back. As is well known, the root of the tongue is so closely connected with the muscles of the larynx that tension there is communicated to the vocal cords. This strain on the vocal cords, together with the changed shape of the mouth resonator, still further increases the tense and unmusical quality of tone which is so common in American voices. As inversion affects

so large a number—over half, in fact—of our speech sounds, its correction becomes a matter of prime importance to any one interested in a free and forward tone.

As to the process of correction. Here, as always, the three senses of sight, hearing, and muscle tension should be called into play. The student should be trained to hear the difference in voice quality between the two types of articulation. The practice of t and d already suggested should establish the feeling of the point-teeth-ridge articulation. Constant use should be made of the mirror. Hamlet's injunction to "speak the speech trippingly on the tongue" serves excellently both as precept and practice. Voice exercises using l, n, and r, correctly placed and combined with various vowels, are invaluable; s, properly articulated and prolonged as a exercise is as useful in securing forward articulation as in correcting nasality. In fact, one of the most delightful features of this method is the dexterity which it develops in the killing of a whole flock of birds with one phonetic stone.

If time had permitted, I should have spoken of other points at which speech and voice meet, especially of that other "black beast" of American speech—the drawl. One more point, however, I must mention, namely, that a clear, forward articulation makes speech so easy to understand that it greatly lessens the tendency to use a loud, noisy tone.

With regard to speech problems in the narrower sense, let us glance at some ways in which phonetics may be of assistance in the correction of such special difficulties as lisping, cluttering, and lolling.

I shall not enter upon the subject of stuttering—"that great Cerbonian bog where whole armies have sunk"—though everyone would admit that clear articulation helps to give the stutterer the confidence he so greatly needs. The rhythmical consonant exercise which has been so successfully used at Bryn Mawr and other schools, originated in England as part of a cure for stuttering.

For the phonetic method in the treatment of lisping, one can without question bring in a true bill. In the first place, this method changes the attitude of those careless lispers of college age who refuse to acknowledge that they do lisp. When such a one is told that there are ten or a dozen clearly defined lisps—among them,

the intradental, the true dental, the inverted, the lip-rounded-and-protruded, the labio-dental, the labio-postdental, the voiceless lateral, both postdental and palatal, and the voiceless nasal (the characteristic cleft palate variety) when he is told which special form of these main types he uses, and when he hears this imitated accurately and without exaggeration, he is usually in a state of lowered resistance to the suggestion that his speech does not represent what a small lisper used to call his "betht thelf."

Exercises can then be given to break up the old habit and establish the new one. A well-trained teacher will have a whole arsenal of devices at hand, and in especially obstinate cases will use the phonetician's pet trick of teaching the proper position for the sound as if it were merely a tongue exercise, in order to prevent the S-stimulus from setting off the old response. After the lisper has perfected this articulation, he can—by the ever-ready conditioned reflex method—establish the new S-habit firmly in his speech. The samt method serves with mispronunciation of l and of other speech sounds.

Similarly, by the proper phonetic analysis and reconditioning of the articulatory habit systems, much can be done to correct lolling and cluttering speech. I am not so fatuous as to claim, however, that the phonetic method alone is sufficient to effect a cure in any of these types of defective speech. What is true of utterance in general is especially true in these cases—that speech is the response of the whole organism to the total situation, and that speech defects are closely connected with problems of social adjustment. A thorough analysis of the student's mental processes, preferably by a properly trained psychiatrist, should, of course, precede any phonetic training.

In the correction of foreign accent, the use of phonetics is practically essential after the age of twelve or fourteen. In order to get the best and quickest results, the teacher should know the whole phonetic basis of the student's native language—especially the accentuation, intonation, and rhythm patterns, on which, more than on individual sounds, the special flavor and indeed the intelligibility of a language depend.

I shall take the French language as an example, since it has so many points of difference from ours. The phonetician can explain

to the French student that in English the accent depends chiefly on stress, instead of on pitch; that, in place of being relatively even and smooth, it is vigorous and jerky; so that, for instance, he must form the habit of saying "university" with the force all concentrated on the *ver*, not "université" with an even flow of tone and a slight singing rise on the *te*.

Further, he must expect the accent to be in general recessive (that is, tending toward the beginning of the word) rather than progressive, as in his own tongue. He can be shown this difference by the changes that occur in the mutual borrowings of the two languages—"Jockey Club," transplanted on French soil, takes its accent on the last syllable, while the French words relating to the automobile, "chauffeur," "tonneau," "garage," hangar," etc., tend to be accented on the first syllable as soon as they become naturalized citizens of our country. The word "automobile" itself is an interesting example of this recessive tendency. When we first took over the word, we retained the French accent of the final syllable; very soon, however, the stress receded to the penult, and many dictionaries still give "auto*mo*bile" as the preferred pronunciation. At present, the pronunciation "*au*tomobile" is more common—at least in the groups with whom I have tested it.

Unfortunately, however, the matter is by no means so simple as this, for in our language so many other factors are involved that the foreigner has to master countless exceptions. It will be of help to him to learn that the English tendency to a recessive accent is to a certain extent counteracted by a number of other influences. Of these the most important are:

1. Survivals of the French progressive accent in many words such as "prestige," "caprice," etc.

2. Survivals of the Anglo-Saxon system of accent on the root of the word in such cases as "*hand*some," "two-*hand*ed," "un-*hand*," "*head*-strong," "hard-*headed*," "a*head*.

3. Survivals of the shifting accent of the Latin language in such words as "*dem*onstrate," "de*mon*strably," "demon*stra*tion," and "demonstra*bil*ity."

4. The influence of rhythm, especially in the words of level stress; as "*six*teen," but "*six*teen-eight," and "sweet six*teen*;"

"*Red Cross,*" but "a *Red* Cross Knight," and "he contributed to the Red *Cross.*"

5. The preservation of the distinction between parts of speech by a shifting of accents, as "*Aug*ust" and "aug*ust,*" "*fre*quent" and "fre*quent,*" "*sub*ject" and "sub*ject.*"

6. The difficulty, especially for the untrained tongue, of saying a number of unaccented syllables in succession. This develops a secondary accent, as in "*labora*tory," "*de*partmental," or pulls the accent forward again, as is observable in the growing tendency to such pronunciations as "con*dole*nce," and "de*co*rous," or leads to dropping a syllable, as in the pronunciation, "ev(e)ry."

Even with the help of all this knowledge, the path to correct accentuation is not easy, and the foreigner must work long and faithfully to attain a reasonable degree of correctness—even, as one might add, as you and I. For what can we do in this perplexing matter but recognize the general tendencies of our language and try to keep step with them by constant and accurate observation of the best speech of our country and our time?

And here a parenthetical word might be allowed regarding the fatal tendency of speech teachers to regard language as static rather than dynamic, and to feel that they have conquered pronunciation once for all, instead of being constantly on the alert to keep up with its ever-changing life.

Stress in phrases is less difficult for the foreigner, because here for once the English language is logical, and he has the guiding principle that the new and important idea, instead of the last syllable, gets the main stress. But the old progressive habit is so hard to break that the Frenchman will have great difficulty in learning to say "Did he *get* it?" instead of "Did he get *it?*"

In the same way he should be taught that in English, unaccented syllables tend toward the neutral position and that his natural inclination to give them their original value will result in something utterly pedantic and un-English.

Again, he must learn that our language prefers closed syllables to open ones, and that his habit of carrying a final consonant over to the next word, while it may seem to him to make for smoothness, does not meet with favor from those who speak English well. A French girl acting the part of the old Lord in *The Admirable*

Crichton touched off quite the wrong response when she sniffed, "What do I smell? A nonion!"

In addition to all this, the French student must learn that in English the variation in intonation is relatively great, and the range of pitch relatively narrow, that assimilation tends to be progressive instead of recessive, that initial and final-voiced consonants are not voiced throughout, that plosives are made with greater aspiration than in French, that t, d, n, are postdentals instead of true dentals, that our vowels are relatively slack and (theoretically) never nasalized.

These general tendencies mastered, he can proceed much more intelligently with his task of learning the individual sounds and combining them into the correct speech patterns. The only French persons whom I have ever known to speak English with a good accent were those who learned the language either as young children or with phonetic instruction.

At this point, I should have liked to discuss the help which phonetics may give in avoiding pedantic and careless speech and in furnishing of short cuts in dramatics, reading, and public speaking. But the applications of phonetics to the study of intonation, phrasing, emphasis, rhythm, and in learning various types of speech are fairly obvious, so I am going to leave them, and, having skirted one Cerbonian Bog, am going to step right into the middle of another.

To discuss dialectical peculiarities of speech is to place oneself squarely in the ranks of those gentry who rush in where angels fear to tread. Our American attitude has been, and in many circles still is, a combination of touchy sensitiveness regarding our own speech and intolerance toward that of other parts of the country. It is best not to hint to a New Englander that New England nasality is of a peculiarly painful variety, even in a country which specializes in nasal tones; nor to a Southerner that the language spoken in his part of the country is influenced by negro speech habits; nor to a New Yorker that Fifth Avenue pronunciation may be affected by First, Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth Avenues; nor to a person living between the Hudson River and the Coast Range north of the Mason and Dixon line, that inversion tends to make his voice harsh. Yet a New Yorker

laughs without fear or demur at the Southern diphthongs, and the Middle Westerner, at the Bostonian *idear of it*. To the phonetician, with his habit of looking at speech phenomena objectively, such an attitude seems foolish and unprofitable.

When the phonetician from New England has analyzed not merely his own speech but that of all parts of his region, and compared it with the characteristic speech of other sections of the United States, he can say dispassionately that, while New England has some of the pleasantest voices and most cultivated speech in the country, it has some of the worst examples of both; that the Yankee nasal drawl has not been exaggerated; and that the letter r occurs even in fairly cultured speech where it does not belong.

The New York City phonetician will, after the same analysis and comparison, say that, while he thinks the voices in his city are possibly a little less strident than in some other parts of the country—perhaps as a measure of self-defense in a place where humanity presses so closely—the general speech level is deplorably low. He may even whisper that three hundred applicants for positions in the New York City Training Schools were rejected this year because of faulty speech. Certainly, he will acknowledge that a large percentage of New Yorkers darken their ɑ's and raise their ɔ almost to the o position (exactly the opposite of the New England tendency regarding these sounds), and that even cultivated New Yorkers tend to round their 3 while the things done by the less discriminating to 3 and ɔi are painful to think of; and as to consonants!

The Southern phonetician will probably admit that, while the South has some of the most charming voices in the world, and while in many localities it has delightful speech tunes, the language of a large part of the South has almost lost its medial and final consonants; that simple vowels have been diphthongized and diphthongs have been simplified and most vowels modified so that it is hard for many Southerners to make themselves understood over the telephone or before a large audience in the North.

The Middle Westerner (using the word in its phonetic sense) will recognize that, while perhaps he has the least slovenly articulation of any part of the country and the best vowels, except for the modifications due to drawling, nasality, and inversion, he has

the defects of his qualities—a tendency to over-heavy articulation of consonants and over-conscientious concern with unaccented vowels, which, together with his habit of inverting, often gives a certain heaviness to his speech and unresonant quality to his voice.

The natives of the Pacific Coast, particularly in the large cities, may console themselves with the thought that in the opinion of many Americans they have on the whole the best speech in the United States—it being perhaps least marred by provincial extremes and not as yet swamped by foreign influences.

After such an analysis, a person could easily decide which of his speech habits interfered either with the utility or with the beauty of his medium of communication, and whether it were worth his effort to modify these or perhaps give them up entirely. One might even imagine a sort of phonetic conference, where various local pronunciations were brought up for appraisal. Take, for instance, that stirrer-up of strife, the *r*, which Professor Grandgent calls the "dog's letter." A Middle Westerner might conceivably say to a Bostonian or a New Yorker, "I don't like your dropping your final r's—it makes your speech sound feeble and savorless; and I simply can't endure your intrusive r. It offends me quite as much as the Cockney habit of putting in h's where they don't belong."

The Easterner might reply, "I think you are justified in regard to my "idear-of-it" habit; it is a lazy way of avoiding the hiatus, and I will try very hard to train my tongue to avoid it. Regarding the r when final or before a final consonant, however, I do not consider your objection valid. Apparently a wave of tendency to weaken or entirely eliminate r in these positions is sweeping over Northern Europe and America, so that the habit which I inherited of dropping the r seems to have as good warrant as the changes covered by Grimm's and Verner's laws. Besides," he might counter, (you know how disputatious the Easterners are, even when their truculence has been a bit softened by phonetic training! "Besides, while I am perfectly willing for you to sound all your r's, I feel that in the interest of pure vowels and pleasant voice quality, you should attempt to overcome your habit of inverting, and substitute the ordinary postdental for this questionable variety."

In the meantime, an equally good-tempered exchange might have been going on between the New Yorker and the Southerner, who had mutually agreed to make concessions; while the Pennsylvanian, the New Jerseyite and the Texan had been listening in, first on one consultation, then on the other: In the end, the members of the conference would probably agree that, with the exception of their common faults of nasality, drawling, and backward production, most parts of the country would not need to make many changes in order to eliminate the habits that have rendered their speech difficult or conspicuous, or even ludicrous or unpleasant, to persons from other parts of the country.

But while I have assumed a Pollyanna-ish tone in discussing this matter, I am frank to say that I do not think the time for such a meeting has come nor will come until there has been much more general analysis of speech, and until an insistent demand for such a meeting has come from all parts of the country. This may sound pusillanimous in the face of the fine enthusiasm of those Speech teachers who feel that unless immediate and drastic measures are taken to force Americans to speak better, our language—the superb heritage of the past—will degenerate until the speech of one part of the country is unintelligible in another part.

But if there is one point that phoneticians insist upon above all others, it is that language, unless it is to be poor artificial thing, must grow from the life and culture of the people whose thought it expresses. It has been said that no people will ever have a better government than they deserve; by the same token, no people will ever have a better language than they deserve—certainly not a better language than they *desire*. As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he—and so speaks he. If not, he is an affected person, and no true man. If, in our thinking, the part of the country in which we happen to live is greater than the whole, we are parochial-minded, and the speech which best represents us is a provincial speech. The more strongly it smacks of the soil, the more truly it will represent us. If we are still a pioneer people, full of vigor and resourcefulness, but more interested in getting things done quickly than in getting them beautifully done, then a vigorous, rough-and-ready speech is that which best expresses us. If, as some of our critics at home and abroad are beginning to think, we are emerging from

the colonial stage of our culture and thinking in terms of a great and independent and unified country, it is perhaps fitting that we should begin to think of the possibility of forming—not borrowing from England, but forming for ourselves—an American speech standard which will satisfy the North and the South, the East and the West, and to which the speech of all educated Americans will tend.

A wild dream, you say? I grant you the present state of our national culture does not encourage such hopes. But there is an old book, no longer very popular, which says, "If there be no vision, the people perish." And who should dream dreams and see visions in this matter if not the teachers of speech of the country? And not that only. We must make our dreams come true, or acknowledge ourselves unworthy of our high calling.

But how, you ask?

First, by beginning at home. By making our own speech more effective and more worthy of imitation.

Then, by continuing the analytical, experimental work in all fields of our subject, in phonetic, physiological, psychological, and physical laboratories, by studying the laws of language from a purely scientific point of view until—as Mr. Durant would say—we have resolved the organism into its organs, the obscure into the known. And along with this, cultivating the literary and artistic side of the work.

Next, by insisting, in season and out of season, that speech be properly taught in all schools from the earliest grades—*especially* in the early grades, where it properly belongs, and where good teaching will make the basic training unnecessary in later years.

Next, by developing a philosophy of speech.

And lastly, by relating speech work in more advanced schools and in colleges much more closely to the general educative and cultural processes than is done at present. In this way, speech training will increasingly become both a cause and a result of our increasing culture.

When these conditions are realized, we may hope to have here in America a speech which will be worthy of us, or rather of what we shall then have become—a speech light and swift and beautiful as a rapier, and "living and powerful and sharp as a two-edged sword."

THE FORUM

OUR NEW OLYMPICS

To The Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir:—A new comet is swinging into our Ken. I seem to have been seeing signs and portents. Either decadence is made manifest or a new birth is in sight. Certainly a new spirit has arisen and points to—what?

How many present have attended a national convention or a provincial meeting of the forensic society bearing the name Pi Kappa Delta? Those who have, have had opportunity to learn anew the significance of such words as enthusiasm, earnestness, devotion, eagerness, and hard work. Here it is. At a Pi Kappa Delta gathering we have veritable Speech Olympic Games. Every college represented is entitled to bring along the whole public speaking menage; a men's debating team, a women's debating team, orators, and extempore speakers, both male and female. With them comes the "coach." At a province meeting, ten or a dozen such caravans, at a national convention—well, there are over a hundred chapters.

The national organization adopts uniform debate questions for the year, one for the men and one for the women. And then everybody turns in and debates everybody else. For judges they use coaches from colleges not interested in the debate in question. At the national meeting in Estes Park a year ago, at least two hundred debates, I am told, were held. Preliminary rounds reduce the brackets to semi-finals and then the finals. At a province meeting there are debates up to twenty and more; all over the place; in churches, class rooms, assembly halls. Wherever four debaters and a judge can gather together in the name of forensics, they argue and render decisions. At the national convention mentioned they overflowed from Estes Park into Greeley and Fort Collins.

Then they rest from debate, gather together and listen to the extemporizers and the orators. In larger gatherings weeding out

preliminaries are held for all four of the speech-making contests, leaving finals in men's extempore, women's extempore, men's oratory, women's oratory. Add the finals in men's debate and women's debate, and there you have a kind of the blaze of eloquence—and glory for the winners—with which the convention ends.

For these finals they call in an "expert" judge. I have served in this capacity twice. An "expert" in forensic decision, I believe, is he not? is a man who is more successful than others in concealing and glossing over his mistakes and prejudices. Anyway, the expert fills the bill by being non-partisan and meaning well. And the prizes get awarded, more or less sensibly and justly .

And here let me record the joy some of my guesses—I mean my decisions—have brought me. In all my experience with debate decisions I have never seen decisions, and crucial ones they are too, accepted with such good sportsmanship. You see Pi Kappa Delta is a fraternity, and they accept it as such: so also they accept their victories and their defeats. Thank Heaven for the advent of brotherhood in the realm of forensic decisions. Have any of you found it before?

Let me record also that I have not met any finer courtesy in debate. Said one debater, and he spoke in all sincerity and simplicity. "If I am quoting my opponent accurately, and I trust I am——" You see, brothers have to feel that way.

Let me record a few impressions from my two meetings with the Olympics. First and greatest is this: here is a National Fair for the exhibition of goods and methods. I have long felt that our national association gatherings lacked one very vital thing, the exhibition of our finished products; Pi Kappa Delta has this every year. And it is amazingly illuminating. We gather and exhibit ourselves; and the things I have heard said about the quality of the public speaking by teachers of public speaking at public speaking conventions!! Then we go home not knowing at all what each other is actually doing and what product he is turning out, except as some of us have scattering debates and contests too. But, two hundred debates at one convention gives a basis for some sort of estimate of standards. Any coach at such a meeting would be quite insensible to new influences who didn't go home full of new ideas and values.

Then there are the boys and girls all working and playing together in a setting of ideals, dignity, social usefulness, and ideas. Underscore that last; Olympics with ideas as the tools and counters. A delightfully clean and bright spirit pervades these meetings. Let the cynic of social relations stay away—no; let somebody force him to go once or twice.

Let me not overlook the round table at the close of the orgy of oratory. Teachers and students carry out set program of discussions that sound amazingly like the subjects at a public speaking section of the N. A. T. S. And they mean business about it too. Like our discussions, some are valuable, others are—what they are. But as we all know, such exercise sets us thinking, and these youngsters honestly try to think.

Then the whole congress is topped off with a speech by the "expert." After he has given his verdict on the six final contests he must judge, he is either ready to seek a sound-proof cave or to unload on the universe a surcharged bosom. But he has no choice; speak he must. This gives a fellow-worker in the field a fine chance to talk to eager ears. Don't think they listen in any perfunctory spirit. Give them a chance in an open forum and they will put you to your purgations on any and all subjects dealing with successful speech. They propose to succeed as speakers, and if you have any help for them they demand that you stand and deliver. It is a fine thing for this "expertness," and the "expert."

One vivid impression I get; there are very few law students at these meetings, but plenty of young preachers. Make of this what you will. What I gather from it is this. Our university forensics are dominated by prospective lawyers; well and good. Our smaller colleges give the prospective preacher a chance. There is a difference. And with good preachers needed and the ministry going through a transition and preachers doing so much of our talking, I am glad they have their chance at a field-day too.

Another bright impression is this. At the N. A. T. S. we are interested in "speech" as an academic subject; a matter of courses, disciplines, branches, fields, research, teaching, administration. At a Pi Kappa Delta meeting, "speech" is almost solely a matter of speaking; how to hold an audience, get a decision, deliver the goods. A wide difference there is, and one to challenge our interest.

From this somewhat rhapsodical account I draw this conclusion: it will pay the National Association of Teachers of Speech to continue keeping an eye on Pi Kappa Delta with its one hundred and ten or more colleges organized already into what is a functioning, vigorous, enthusiastic national association of teachers of speech all its own. Excellent steps were taken last year by the administration. I wonder how many of the teachers in those colleges are interested in the N. A. T. S. We need their enthusiasm fully as much as they need our dignity—or what have we? But at present they seem quite able to get on by themselves. There is something of a challenge here.

If any of you, "experts," get a chance to sit with one of these Olympic games be sure you will get an ear full—I listened to sixty speeches in three days; but be sure you will come away stimulated and renewed in your faiths.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES H. WOOLBERT, *University of Iowa*

THE OREGON PLAN OF DEBATE

To The Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir:—I have a good word to say—several of them in fact—for what seems to be known as the "Oregon Plan" of debate. Mr. Gray introduced it last year in the April issue of THE JOURNAL and, quite frankly, it interested me not at all, probably because its good features came all tangled up with non-decision debating and that Oxford importation, the humorously inclined contest. Humor is excellent when it is natural, the spontaneous combustion of the subject, but a rather sad and dejected affair when a superimposed copy of the original; with us the non-decision debate has been tried and proved to be a failure. Any plan with such features would be too expensive.

Nevertheless, a few nights ago I journeyed forth with a debate team to witness the "Oregon Plan" in operation and came back—with the good words to say. Not for the non-decision or the "humorous" debate. These, it seems, were purely chance accompaniments of the plan as first applied, at least they have proved completely detachable from it, accidents rather than differentia. The scheme in relation to type and length of speeches, cross-exam-

ination, etc. (Mr. Gray outlines these, this JOURNAL, Vol. XII. No. 2, pp. 178-179) was fully carried out in a debate which certainly did not put entertainment as its object and one with an expert judge to give a decision as eagerly awaited and apparently as necessary under the new plan as the old.

Score 1 for the "Oregon Plan," shorn of its non-essentials, came with the reason for distinct hostility to it on the part of the coach of the opposing team. She liked it not at all because only good or "experienced" debaters could use it well—an excellent thing in a debate plan, it seemed to me. The fact is this, and it became increasingly evident during the course of the evening: a speaker who does not know the subject thoroughly and who is unable to think clearly and straight cannot go through the contest without his deficiencies becoming perfectly obvious. He must either stand ten minutes of straight cross-examination, a thing out of the question with the memorized speech type, or give the complete ten minutes of rebuttal for his side. It is a deep-dyed secret, shared by all coaches, that under the present plan a very weak brother or sister with a little memory can be so worked upon that his deficiencies are hidden from all save the most all-seeing judge. No student gains largely by such preparation. It is simply parrot work. Under the "Oregon Plan" the state of such a person is perfectly and utterly patent. On the other hand, a premium is put on basic ability and trained thought. Questions must be asked and answered with a realization of the implications involved, an advantage which suddenly appears must be pushed, inferences made obvious. In short, the debate tends to become a live, vital contest between individuals mentally alert and able to respond to changing situations, not a matter of placing in juxtaposition pre-rigidified subject-matter. There is movement, give-and-take, "pep" and these without resort to vaudeville technique and content, these while debate is kept on a high intellectual level. Granted, the plan would be much more exacting for both debater and coach. "Coaches," in the derogatory sense, would be in difficult straits; training would of necessity get below memory depth—disadvantages or advantages according to one's theory of values.

Very truly yours,

GLADYS MURPHY GRAHAM, *Los Angeles, California*

ASSOCIATION NEWS

1927 CONVENTION

After a good deal of correspondence and investigation, it seems best to the Executive Council that our 1927 convention should be held at Cincinnati on December 28th, 29th and 30th. Our convention headquarters in Cincinnati will be Hotel Sinton.

Other organizations scheduled to meet in Cincinnati during the week between Christmas and the New Year are: the American Philological Association, the Linguistic Society of America, the College Art Association, and the Archaeological Institute of America. The latest word is that the American Association of University Professors is also giving favorable consideration to the claims of Cincinnati for its convention during the same week. There is a possibility of our Association holding joint sessions with two or three of these other societies, if to do so seems desirable to our membership and to theirs.

Plans are now under way for the formulation of our convention program. Suggestions as to topics, speakers, and other aspects of program-making will be extremely welcome. Such suggestions should be sent to the President of the ASSOCIATION. It is our hope that the 1927 meeting will eclipse all others in attendance and that the program may at least maintain the high standards set at Chicago last year.

ANDREW T. WEAVER, *President, National Association of Teachers of Speech*

CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF SPEECH CORRECTION

[This constitution will be submitted to the National Association of Teachers of Speech at the next convention.—Ed.]

The following document is confirmed by its signatories as the official constitution of the American Academy of Speech Correction.

ARTICLE I

The purposes of the American Academy of Speech Correction shall be—

(1) to stimulate among educators, physicians and others of the general public a deeper, more intelligent interest in problems of speech correction.

(2) to raise as rapidly as possible existing standards of practice among workers in the field of speech correction.

(3) to secure public recognition of the practice of speech correction as an organized *profession.*

(4) to furnish this new profession with responsible and authoritative leadership.

(5) to make this leadership generally respected by our good works, i. e., by our scholarly research work, publicity work and administrative skill.

(6) to make membership in our organization a coveted recognition of merit and in this way to furnish workers in the field of speech correction with a powerful incentive to greater achievements.

ARTICLE II

MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Charter membership in the American Academy of speech correction is automatically granted to the signatories of this document. These signatories may retain their charter memberships in the American Academy of Speech Correction together with the full rights and privileges appertaining thereto, as long as they pay their dues and maintain their *professional integrity* as hereinafter described.

Section 2. A maximum of five new members may be elected to the American Academy of Speech Correction each year from among the ranks of *eligible candidates.*

Section 3. Election of new members from among the ranks of eligible candidates shall be left to the discretion of a *membership committee.* Unanimous decisions of the membership sommittee shall be required for the election of any candidate.

This committee shall consist of ten members of the Academy appointed by the president to serve during his term of office.

The Academy president shall distribute his appointments to the membership committee in such manner that there shall be represented thereon ten different institutions, ten different states, and, if possible, ten different "spheres of interest" within the field of speech correction.

Section 4. The membership committee shall be limited in its consideration of candidates to such individuals as meet the following qualifications:

(1) Active present participation either in actual clinical work in speech correction or in administrative duties immediately concerned with the supervision and direction of such work.

(2) Possession of an M. D., Ph. D., D. D. S., or of a Master's degree, in the securing of which degree important work shall have been done in speech correction or some closely allied field such as psychology, phonetics, modern languages, mental hygiene, psychiatry or medicine.

(3) Publication of original research in the form of a monograph, magazine article, or book.

(4) Possession of a professional reputation untainted by a past record (or present record) of unethical practices such as blatant commercialization of professional services, or guaranteeing of "cures" for stated sums of money.

(5) A bona-fide interest in speech made manifest by continued membership in the National Association of Teachers of Speech.

Section 5. The membership committee shall examine the qualifications of each eligible candidate for membership either in person or by mail, with the express provision that the committee will elect no one who is not known personally to at least two members of the membership committee or ten members of the Acad-

emy at large. All correspondence will be subject to review by the chairman of the committee, and, on request, by the president of the Academy as member ex-officio of the committee, before the candidate can be accepted officially into the Academy.

Section 6. The Academy shall confer honorary memberships at its discretion on such persons as are not eligible for active membership, yet who satisfy the Academy that they have made outstanding contributions in pure science relating to speech correction. Such elections to honorary membership shall be effected by two-thirds vote of an official quorum session of the Academy as a whole.

Honorary memberships shall entitle the incumbent to all the rights and privileges pertaining to membership in the Academy without expense but with the express qualification that such honorary member shall have no vote in any meeting of the Academy on any matter whatsoever.

ARTICLE III

OFFICERS OF THE ACADEMY

Section 1. The officers of this Academy shall consist of a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary and a Treasurer.

Section 2. Full executive powers shall be vested in the President of the Academy. Together with the other officers of the Academy he shall hold office for a term of two years and be elected by nomination from the floor followed by Australian ballot by the attending members of the Academy at an officially designated convention.

It shall be the duty of the President—

(1) To preside at all regular meetings of the Academy.

(2) to call emergency meetings of the Academy or any of its committees.

(3) to appoint all members of authorized committees.

(4) to define the duties of committees wherever such duties may not have been adequately defined by the Academy.

(5) to promote the interests of the Academy to the best of his ability in all ways.

Section 3. The Vice-President shall be automatically vested with the full power of the President on the death of the latter, his impeachment or his inability to attend to his presidential duties during a convention session for any reason.

Section 4. The Secretary shall record and file the regular minutes of all official meetings of the Academy. He shall also receive and file copies of the minutes of important committee meetings and handle all correspondence necessary to the proper performance of his official duties.

Section 5. The Treasurer shall be intrusted with the collection and safe-keeping of the Academy's lawful funds, subject to the expressed wishes of the members of the Academy in their official meetings.

The Treasurer shall be bonded at the direction of the President when funds entrusted to his care shall reach or exceed two thousand dollars.

The Treasurer shall be the only official of the Academy authorized to draw money from the Academy's funds and make expenditures therefrom.

ARTICLE IV

IMPEACHMENT

Section 1. An officer of the Academy may be removed from office by a two-thirds vote of the members of a quorum session of an official convention following presentation of a petition signed by one-third of the membership of the Academy.

The presiding officer at the trial shall be the highest executive officer of the Academy in good standing available at the time of the impeachment.

Conviction of an officer of the Academy shall

carry as an automatic penalty permanent loss of membership.

Section 2. A member of the Academy, not an executive officer, may be dropped from membership by a vote of seven of the ten members of the membership committee. A clearly substantiated complaint submitted by a member of the Academy to the membership committee impugning the professional integrity of another member of the Academy shall constitute cause for examining the member specified in the complaint.

In case of conviction by the committee, the defendant may appeal from the decision of the membership committee to a decision of the Academy at large in official session, where impeachment proceedings and penalty or conviction shall be similar to that of an officer of the Academy.

ARTICLE V

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Section 1. The constitution of the Academy may be amended by a two-thirds vote of a quorum session of an official Academy meeting.

BY-LAWS

Section 1. A meeting of the Academy shall be called at least once every year. This meeting shall be a national meeting coinciding in time and place with a national meeting of the National Association of Teachers of Speech. No sectional meetings of the Academy shall be considered official.

Section 2. Meetings of the Academy shall be called at the direction of the President or by agreement of the Academy in official session.

Section 3. A meeting of the Academy officially called may transact business provided a quorum is present.

A quorum shall normally constitute one-half of the total current membership of the Academy.

In the event that the President of the Academy

may deem it necessary to declare an emergency, he is authorized to declare that the members present at any official meeting shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the emergency business.

Section 4. Membership in the Academy shall entail a regular yearly fee of $3.00 (three dollars).

Official admission into the Academy, of new members, shall require the payment of an initiation fee of $15.00.

Special assessments upon the members of the Academy may be levied at the direction of the Academy in official convention.

Section 5. A member of the Academy whose membership or assessment fees are two years in arrears shall be automatically deprived of all regular privileges of membership in the Academy.

A member of the Academy whose membership or assessment fees are three years in arrears shall be automatically dropped from the membership rolls of the Academy.

Section 6. By-Laws of the Academy may be amended by a majority vote of a quorum session.

NEW BOOKS

[As far as possible staff reviewers are assigned to cover the new books, but voluntary contributions are always welcome, especially if concise and informative. Reviews, or suggestions of books to be reviewed should be sent to Hoyt H. Hudson, Princeton University.]

Child Guidance. By SMILEY BLANTON, B. S., M. D., and MARGARET GRAY BLANTON. Introduction by THOMAS W. SALMON, M. D., Century Company, 1927, pp. xi., 294.

The foreword by the authors sets forth that the purpose of child guidance is not primarily the curing of behavior disorders, but rather the prevention of such disorders. This commendable point of view is steadily maintained throughout the entire book and flavors every illustration and every suggestion made. The book is offered "as a supplement to the child guidance clinic and is an effort to meet the need where no clinics exist." One gathers that the book is intended for parents and teachers of non-scientific training, for college students and for members of study clubs. It is the opinion of the present reviewer that the book straddles its potential reading public. It would seem to me that it might be a much more effective book if it were not written with so many different sorts of readers in mind.

Dr. Salmon in his introduction emphasizes the presence of the powerful unconscious life and the part that suggestion plays in its control and modification.

The book is divided into three parts: the first part, theoretical considerations; second part, practical methodology of child guidance; third part, the case history.

In their emphasis upon suggestion, the authors have announced their position in the field of scientific child guidance. They stand at that wing of the movement that is exactly opposite to those who emphasize training by exercise and practice. In many places the

factors of suggestion upon which they rely seem to be very superficial. Note for example:

> **One of the most effective devices for the usual mild case of this sort [enuresis] is for the physician to write or have typed on a card, preferably a rather official looking card, a few words to the effect that the child will wake when he feels the desire or necessity to urinate. The card is given to the child and placed by him under his pillow at night. The parent reads the card to the child or the child reads it, just before going to sleep. If this does not work the first night, it may afterward. The effect of such suggestions is usually somewhat delayed. (Page 65).**

This use of suggestion must be regarded as *mere* suggestion. Suggestion that is most effective in modifying this powerful unconscious undertow of a child's life must be suggestion motivated by a direct connection with his primitive and often unconscious desires. A suggestion that is made simply as a sort of a hypnodial appeal cannot be ultimately and primarily successful. Further: the medical profession (which one of our authors represents) is purging its methodology of a great deal of the mysticism of this sort of therapy. The suggestion of a sort of a supernatural knowledge and a spiritual allegiance with secret and mystic powers, that the medieval physician cultivated for his therapeutic effects, is fast being discountenanced by modern medicine. This suggestion made for the cure of enuresis is distinctly of the type made by the old mystic physicians.

Another general comment on the work concerns the vagueness and ambiguity of much of the quasi-technical description. This is particularly true of the third part of the book in which the authors attempt to simplify for the novice the task of writing of case history. They have provided a sort of a rating sheet for the picturing of the personality of the case under study. They have attempted to rate on a 12 point scale such elusive factors as aggressiveness, self-confidence, suggestibility, etc. It would seem that this rating sheet would merely tempt the historian to cloud his anamneses by his own interpretation, rather than to report facts as facts on the basis of which he or someone else could make an interpretation.

In this rating scale many of the qualities considered are rated from one extreme of "group adjustment" to the other extreme of "ego adjustment." Self-confidence, for example, is rated as follows:

The extreme group adjustment is described as "timid and self-distrustful, shy, never makes decisions, self-effacing." The ideal average is described as "modest but willing to stand up for rights, able to make decisions, docile." The extreme ego adjustment is described as "absolutely confident and sure of his own decisions; takes everything as his due."

To illustrate how difficult it would be for the parent to rate a child upon this scale and to determine whether on the whole the child is of extreme group adjustment or extreme ego adjustment, let us notice some of the descriptions of personality offered as explanation of this rating scale.

Suppose we had a child answering the following description: timid and self-distrustful, shy, never makes decisions, self-effacing, never fights for anything, or is teased and bullied by others or is imposed upon; too easily modified by suggestion; never leads; always follows; solitary; prefers to be alone; seclusive; unpopular; avoided. How would we classify such a child? Referring to chapters 17 and 18 we would say that a child answering *this specific description* would be classified at two extremes of the scale. In short the same child would be both of the "extreme ego" and the "extreme group adjustment" type, which of course is impossible. Suppose we take another child described as absolutely confident and sure of his own decisions; takes everything as his due; has his own way at all costs; never considers the rights of others, or is a bully, cruel, not modified by suggestion; ignores requests, signs, rules; is leader of his gang; autocratic. This child, if rated on the Blanton rating, would show evidences of the two extremes. Note also that the Blantons give the following as a quality of *extreme ego* adjustment: Not modified by suggestion; ignores requests, signs, rules. They also give as a quality of *extreme group* adjustment what is almost synonymous with the above, namely, that the child is a leader of his gang and autocratic. What help, then, is this rating scale to a parent who is attempting to find out where his child belongs? Under different headings the same behavior symptoms mean opposite traits of character. It is this vagueness that is liable to rob the book of its usefulness in the hands of the beginner.

After all, the best blank for the taking of case histories is a plain white sheet of paper. To use such a blank requires very care-

ful training and the absence of such training cannot safely be compensated for by an artificial rating scale.

Chapter 21 entitled "Personality Study" suggests the topics that such a trained person should consider in studying and writing a case history, and this outline is an excellent one. I think even the novice would make more profitable use of that short chapter than of all the rest of the chapters in part three.

With particular regard to speech, the book includes one chapter entitled "Learning to Talk," the latter half of which is concerned with disorders of speech. In addition to that, on pages 35 and 36, the problem of thumb-sucking is discussed. In that this practice modifies the palatal arch and thus effects certain of the lingual-palatal adjustments for speech, it has a very direct connection with speech correction. It is also of diagnostic value in the study of the child's emotional life. The Blantons say that "thumb-sucking is established as a habit in response to hunger or a sensation caused by overfeeding and mistaken for hunger by the infant or because of an unsatisfactory diet," and they suggest that "the remedy lies in diet and sunshine." It seems to the reviewer that they omit the very definitely reversive features of thumb-sucking. Many a well-nourished child practices thumb-sucking as a sort of a solace, a retreat into infantilism from the perplexing realities of his growing life. Many cases of thumb-sucking cannot be properly handled without taking into consideration this introvertive tendency.

Another item of detail that should be considered by way of criticism of the speech phases of the book is the classification of disorders of speech. This classification is made entirely upon the basis of symptomology; delayed speech, oral inactivity, letter sound substitution, stuttering. Such a classification on the basis of symptoms seems wholly inadequate in that the proper handling of the case does not consider symptoms so much as etiology. A practical division, then, would be a division on the basis of causation. The Blantons are evdently very conversant with this fact in that they emphasize a certain similar causation for each of these four types.

Under the head of *delayed speech,* for example, the authors state that it may be caused by "unhealthy emotional attitudes," and they suggest as treatment that "such cases need careful study

The extreme group adjustment is described as "timid and self-distrustful, shy, never makes decisions, self-effacing." The ideal average is described as "modest but willing to stand up for rights, able to make decisions, docile." The extreme ego adjustment is described as "absolutely confident and sure of his own decisions; takes everything as his due."

To illustrate how difficult it would be for the parent to rate a child upon this scale and to determine whether on the whole the child is of extreme group adjustment or extreme ego adjustment, let us notice some of the descriptions of personality offered as explanation of this rating scale.

Suppose we had a child answering the following description: timid and self-distrustful, shy, never makes decisions, self-effacing, never fights for anything, or is teased and bullied by others or is imposed upon; too easily modified by suggestion; never leads; always follows; solitary; prefers to be alone; seclusive; unpopular; avoided. How would we classify such a child? Referring to chapters 17 and 18 we would say that a child answering *this specific description* would be classified at two extremes of the scale. In short the same child would be both of the "extreme ego" and the "extreme group adjustment" type, which of course is impossible. Suppose we take another child described as absolutely confident and sure of his own decisions; takes everything as his due; has his own way at all costs; never considers the rights of others, or is a bully, cruel, not modified by suggestion; ignores requests, signs, rules; is leader of his gang; autocratic. This child, if rated on the Blanton rating, would show evidences of the two extremes. Note also that the Blantons give the following as a quality of *extreme ego* adjustment: Not modified by suggestion; ignores requests, signs, rules. They also give as a quality of *extreme group* adjustment what is almost synonymous with the above, namely, that the child is a leader of his gang and autocratic. What help, then, is this rating scale to a parent who is attempting to find out where his child belongs? Under different headings the same behavior symptoms mean opposite traits of character. It is this vagueness that is liable to rob the book of its usefulness in the hands of the beginner.

After all, the best blank for the taking of case histories is a plain white sheet of paper. To use such a blank requires very care-

ful training and the absence of such training cannot safely be compensated for by an artificial rating scale.

Chapter 21 entitled "Personality Study" suggests the topics that such a trained person should consider in studying and writing a case history, and this outline is an excellent one. I think even the novice would make more profitable use of that short chapter than of all the rest of the chapters in part three.

With particular regard to speech, the book includes one chapter entitled "Learning to Talk," the latter half of which is concerned with disorders of speech. In addition to that, on pages 35 and 36, the problem of thumb-sucking is discussed. In that this practice modifies the palatal arch and thus effects certain of the lingual-palatal adjustments for speech, it has a very direct connection with speech correction. It is also of diagnostic value in the study of the child's emotional life. The Blantons say that "thumb-sucking is established as a habit in response to hunger or a sensation caused by overfeeding and mistaken for hunger by the infant or because of an unsatisfactory diet," and they suggest that "the remedy lies in diet and sunshine." It seems to the reviewer that they omit the very definitely reversive features of thumb-sucking. Many a well-nourished child practices thumb-sucking as a sort of a solace, a retreat into infantilism from the perplexing realities of his growing life. Many cases of thumb-sucking cannot be properly handled without taking into consideration this introvertive tendency.

Another item of detail that should be considered by way of criticism of the speech phases of the book is the classification of disorders of speech. This classification is made entirely upon the basis of symptomology; delayed speech, oral inactivity, letter sound substitution, stuttering. Such a classification on the basis of symptoms seems wholly inadequate in that the proper handling of the case does not consider symptoms so much as etiology. A practical division, then, would be a division on the basis of causation. The Blantons are evdently very conversant with this fact in that they emphasize a certain similar causation for each of these four types.

Under the head of *delayed speech,* for example, the authors state that it may be caused by "unhealthy emotional attitudes," and they suggest as treatment that "such cases need careful study

and training, and nearly always the home conditions must be modified." Note an almost similar statement of etiology and therapy under the head of oral inactivity, which they say may be due "to some emotional conflict" and further state that "in nearly every case emotional re-education is also necessary since there has been built up a series of little fears and feelings of insecurity because of the speech difficulty." Under *letter sound substitution* they say: "the majority are caused by emotional conflicts" and they suggest as treatment: "even in those cases which are the result of organic difficulties, there will be certain fears and emotional reactions connected with speech which must be eliminated before a cure can be effected." Under *stuttering* they say that "it is a defect of the emotions—an undue sensitiveness, a feeling of inferiority, which interferes with the progress of the individual," and in talking about its therapy state: "In mental hygiene the fundamental thing is the changing of the general emotional actions and the correcting of faulty attitudes which give rise to tension."

These quotations are made to show the tremendous emphasis, and perhaps an over-emphasis, that the Blantons place upon the emotional problems in speech disorders, and also to demonstrate the awkwardness of a classification that does not take into consideration the partition of the field that the authors emphatically consider most significant in the *treatment* of these disorders.

Again, under *oral inactivity* no mention is made of low intelligence as a causative factor. Deafness is not mentioned as one of the etiologies of this type. Deafness is not mentioned under the head of *letter sound substitution.* No mention is made under the head of *stuttering* of these occasional cases of purely organic stuttering that do not vary in their severity with the social situation, and that are hence manifestly not emotionally activated. No mention is made at all of organic conditions such as aphasia, hair lip, cleft palate, dysphonia, paralytic speech, etc. The chapter would be much more helpful if a reclassification were made and factors considered other than the emotional ones.

So much for the few adverse criticisms. The book on the whole is a very excellent one. There is an amazing amount of practical illustrative material. One marvels at the ability of the authors to recall from their vast clinical experience just the right illustra-

tive case for every point in their theory. It is this that makes the book so delightfully readable and most practical. I should say for the student of child guidance it is the most helpful book I have ever read, and is indispensable to the beginner.

ROBERT WEST, *Madison, Wis.*

Preaching in Medieval England: An Introduction to Sermon Manuscripts of the Period c. 1350-1450. By G. R. OWST. Cambridge, 1926.

In this substantial and meritorious book, wherein the author has uncovered from manuscripts an enormous amount of useful and interesting material, I would recommend that students of the history of Rhetoric read particularly Part III—the chapters devoted to Sermons: The Sermon Literature and Its Types; Manuals and Treatises; and Sermon-Making, or the Theory and Practice of Sacred Eloquence. From these chapters the reader will gain important information, although he will here find the author's occasionally forced literary style less fitted for the exposition of the subject than in earlier parts of the book. The present reviewer would maintain that a straightforward reproduction *in extenso* of one or a few of the briefer typical manuals on sermon-method might have given a clearer and more unified picture of medieval theory; and that the author could have made this part of his contribution even more telling by a greater number of comparisons with manuals, treatises, and sermons which have appeared on the European continent, and by the more frequent use of scholarly works thereon produced by German and French writers. As one would expect, sermon-technique in England appears to have been exactly the same as that which characterized contemporary continental theory and practice, exhibiting identity even in terminology. So far as I can discover, the English diverged only in the general use of the term *antetheme* for *protheme*. Indeed, for the wisely eclectic student, Owst's book must now take its place as an authoritative reference help on medieval preaching beside the works of the Continental scholars, Cruel, Linsenmayer, Lecoy de la Marche, Bourgain, Gilson, and de Poorter.

Part I and Part II, which deal with the Preachers, and the Preaching Scene, are better written. The reader who seeks an ar-

tistic rhetorical critique will in Part II find some treatment of the preacher's audience; he will probably be less concerned with the implications of the bias which the author at times shows in the interpretation and criticism of various preachers and scholars who come under examination.

Dr. Owst has covered a great deal of ground and has discovered a wide prospect of rich manuscript material to be yet further studied by scholars. For the century he has investigated he reports (p. 66) no less than forty names of sermon-compilers among the Carmelites alone! It is ungrateful then to complain of what the author has failed to do. His pages are stimulating, and abound in valuable observations.

HARRY CAPLAN, *Cornell University*

Phonetic Transcription and Transliteration, Proposals of the Copenhagen Conference, April 1925. New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1926. pp. 32.

"Scholars have often felt the desirability of having one single system of phonetic transcription and transliteration of foreign alphabets instead of the prevailing chaos, in which each phonetician thinks himself justified in using his own personal system, many writers even using different systems at different periods of their own lives." This desirability must have been keenly felt by anyone who has read more than one book on phonetics and has discovered that, with each new work, he is first confronted by the task of making himself familiar with the particular system used before he can carry on with the study of the contents of the book. It would be a slight exaggeration to say that a uniform scheme of transcription, to be used by all writers on phonetics, is necessary. There were, indeed, many excellent bits of phonetic investigation done and recorded long before anyone thought of calling himself a phonetician or of using a phonetic alphabet. But a uniform system is unquestionably desirable.

It is far more important that a system be recommended, adopted, and actually used by a large number of the best phoneticians, preferably by all, than that it have any particular intrinsic merit, such as pleasing appearance, ease of writing, or even consistency within itself. The list of scholars participating in the

Copenhagen Conference, "the selection being made not according to the nationality of the scholars, but according to their special competence, so as to have the principal groups of languages represented," is sufficiently impressive to recommend this particular system, whether it may appear better or worse in its details than any other scheme.

The principles which guided the Conference seem to have been such, however, as to promise certain intrinsic advantages. They decided that their "system must have a certain elasticity." They recognized the value of Sweet's distinction between "narrow" and "broad" transcription and that of Jones's excellent distinction between "sounds" and "phonemes." They based their system on the Latin alphabet but without too much concern for the printer's standard fonts. They did not exactly compromise between monotypes and diacritical marks; rather they "did not decide one-sidely in favour of one or the other of these rival systems, but chose in an eclectic spirit for some sounds a monotype notation, for other sounds diacritical marks, giving in some cases preference to neither system, but allowing signs of both to be used as alternatives." "One of the main objects of the Conference was to do away with the worst of those ambiguities which are caused by the same sign being used for totally different purposes by various scholars." "The signs selected should as far as possible form a consistent system, the same modifications or diacritics being used everywhere with the same signification." "Phonetic signs should be as easy to remember as possible."

We may rather have had the impression that a very similar set of principles governed the formation of the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association, although this report, while generally speaking well of that system, does call it "less systematic." When we find, then, that the new scheme differs from that of the I. P. A. in detail after detail, in several of the symbols for standard sounds, *e. g.* the *th* sounds so common in English, and especially in the marks indicating special modification of sounds, quantity, stress, syllabic function, etc., we are inclined to ask why these signs, most of them not new, were considered better than those of the I. P. A., which many have thought of as being on the road to general adoption. The report always gives reasons for its

preferences, satisfactory reasons. The system seems to be more systematic, more "reasonable" than others.

As a system existing in a pamphlet and adopted by the dozen members of the Conference, it is, of course, only one more element of confusion. If everybody—well almost everybody—would subordinate their pet notions about transcription to the idea of writing in such a fashion that everybody else could easily read what they have written; if they would exercise a friendly fortitude in refusing to inflict upon others the little curlicues of which they are so fond because they thought of them; if they would make this system, or any other system for that matter, serve their purpose, and this system looks to be sufficiently adaptable to serve any phonetic purpose—then they could spend more of their energy in discovering something about the sounds of language, instead of wasting it trying to devise new pictures for what little they already know. And those who would inform themselves as to what the investigators are doing could understand without having to spend half their time in discovering what the curlicues might mean. Something has to be done, of course, to get the thing settled. From time to time the less nearly adequate system has to be revised and the more nearly adequate adopted. Bell's scheme had to give way. But for the present state of affairs phonetic, this is the more nearly adequate. The better plan must be adopted in conference, not by individuals. Here is the Conference. Here is the system. If a great majority of users of phonetic alphabets, scholars as well as practical teachers, decide to prefer the alphabet of the I. P. A. to that of the Copenhagen Conference, we can put this pamphlet on some shelf to collect dust. But the alphabet of the I. P. A. has not gained anything like universal acceptance, as the fact of the calling of the Conference, as well as other facts, indicates. We might give this system a trial.

Although this was a Conference of "scholars" and the system was chosen as being useful for scholars, it is not the less useful for those who are concerned with practical classroom problems in dealing with pronunciation. Indeed, its being more systematic should make it more useful.

Twenty-eight of the sections of the pamphlet, those dealing with phonetic transcription, were drawn up by Otto Jespersen,

who has given us so many excellent works on the English language; the twenty-ninth, on transliteration, by Holger Pedersen.

LEE S. HULTZEN, *Hanover, N. H.*

Technique in Dramatic Art. BY HALLIAM BOSWORTH. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1926. Pp. 438. $3.50.

The title page of this book carries the following explanation of its scope:

A delineation of the art of acting by means of its underlying principles and scientific laws.

With technical instruction in the art of play production and public speaking.

The text is less dogmatic than the first of these statements might lead one to expect. Mr. Bosworth, in a short preface, acknowledges the individual character of the actor's problems and the difficulty that one meets in attempting to take an objective view of one's own work and method. Nevertheless he proceeds to the task, generalizing upon the basis of his own experience and observation, and has produced a book that is full of practical hints and suggestions to the young actor.

It is in this practicality, both in the topics treated and the language employed, that the merit of the book resides. One feels that this is the way that things are actually done, at least by some, and, elementary as many of the suggestions are, their justification may be found in the lack of attention to detail that marks many an amateur and academic production. There are so many topics treated in the twenty-six chapters of the book that an enumeration is scarcely necessary. Suffice it to say that here is a comprehensive manual of stage practice written in the language of the profession, out of experience.

One may grant this value to the book and find it a useful text to put in the hands of students without agreeing that it succeeds in discovering the "underlying principles and scientific laws" of acting. Directors will frequently wish to read "hardly ever" where Mr. Bosworth has written "never." Methods, however useful and however general their employment, do not constitute Laws. *Technique In Dramatic Art* deals with the craft, rather than the art, of acting and is, perhaps, the more useful because it does so. Theories and objectives of the art of the theater show a decided tendency to

vary with the director but the student's need to know the fundamentals of the proper management of his voice and person in action or in repose exists in all schools.

The chapters dealing with production and public speaking are less comprehensive than might be expected from the announcement of the field of the book. They bring it into comparison with works dealing exclusively with these subjects somewhat to its disadvantage in respect to completeness of treatment. The chapter on Make-Up is, on the other hand, the most helpful that has come to the present writer's attention.

The book is illustrated with photographs and diagrams and carries an appreciative foreword by Oliver Hinsdale. It is a pioneer in its field and would seem indispensable to teachers or directors desiring a book of this type.

PHILIP M. HICKS, *Swarthmore College*

Modern Theatres. By IRVING PICHEL, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1925.

"Architectural ineptitudes are more likely to be perpetuated and in time condoned than those in any other art . . . . In the theatre this perpetuation of musty, tradition-hallowed faults of construction has been carried to an extraordinary extreme." Irving Pichel here expresses what a great many people all over the country have often thought. Indeed, what amateur producer has not cursed in his time the inadequacies of the stage in our average school or college auditorium? Usually strong language and apologies are all that happen. But sometimes something might actually be done to remedy the situation.

Most amateur directors engaged in producing good plays on bad stages are fully aware that things are not what they ought to be. Perhaps they are not so sure, though, just what they ought to be. The authorities may be generous enough to spend a few hundreds in remodelling; they may even be so indulgent as to promise a new theatre. Will the director know how to advise the remodellers or the builders? Will he know just what type of stage and auditorium are best suited to the peculiar circumstances? That is where Irving Pichel comes in.

In his own words Mr. Pichel is not a prophet but a reporter.

He is not announcing the theatre of tomorrow. His aim is to acquaint the reader with the ideal features of a good modern stage and theatre. He tells what ought to be. He is not so much concerned with the elaborate complexities of the professional stage as he is with the simpler school and community theatres, the Little Theatres. He writes to forestall some of the commonest mistakes.

Little Theatres all over the country are laboring under two great errors, errors of imitation and ingenuity. Nowhere are traditions stronger than they are in the theatre. If the big theatre in the city is built in such-and-such a way, then the new little theatre in the suburb must copy it, even though the paint-bridge takes up most of the space back stage and is utterly useless as far as painting goes. If the State University has a certain type of stage in its auditorium—and probably nearly every one in the University heartily damns the auditorium, particularly the stage—then the nearby district high school must ape the University and have its assembly room a miniature auditorium. Real instances of such practices are all around us.

Who has not run across the clever director who performs stunts with no equipment? Give him a hall, some composition board, a little paint, and a couple of automobile spot lights, and watch things happen. Amazing! A *tour de force* of ingenuity! But hardly good theatre. The danger is that people, carried away by enthusiasm, may come to regard the ingenious concoctions of the resourceful producer as ends in themselves instead of what they really are—clever substitutes for artistic production. A large share of the arduous ingenuity in our Little Theatres is wasted effort.

Mr. Pichel, however, is not a worshipper of elaborate mechanism, of Fortuny lighting, dome horizonts, and revolving stages. He emphatically asserts that it is artists that count, not equipment. Most of the newest devices on our big stages are of comparatively little use to the Little Theatres. But the Little Theatre should know what is best suited to its peculiar needs. It should know what ought to be. Its stage should be one that can be "used easily, by everybody who wishes to use it, and which will give readily, in return for effort spent upon it, a revenue of beauty." "These pages will achieve enough if they go a little way toward eliminating the

usual inept, difficult constructions that for these many years have cumbered the ways of folks, young and old, who wish to entertain themselves in the theatre."

If every amateur worker in the theatre could absorb the leading principles in Mr. Pichel's book, even if they did no more than study the excellent illustrations, it is safe to say that a good share of the glaring blunders uselessly perpetrated every day in our school and community theatres would be avoided.

MARVIN HERRICK, *University of Illinois*

The Process of Play Production. A Book for the Non-Professional Theatre Worker. By ALLEN CRAFTON and JESSICA ROYER. F. S. Crofts & Co., N. Y. 1926. $2.50.

It is ten years since Emerson Taylor's pioneer and still useful handbook *Practical Stage Directing for Amateurs* appeared. The various volumes in the same field, to the number of about half a dozen, which have come out at intervals since, deviate but little from his general plan, which embraces choice of the play, organization, rehearsing, acting, make-up, scenery, lighting, and costume. Nor does *The Process of Play Production*, now under consideration, show many radical departures from the usual table of contents.

Yet, though this work of Crafton and Royer owes much to its predecessors, it has a timbre and viewpoint of its own, certain new additions, and a scheme of organization which give it a distinct place among its fellows, one which it should hold and maintain by its substance and mode of presentation.

One wishes the last chapter, "Teaching Play Production," might have given more space to the methods of teaching. But the stand against routine plans for courses is firm. "It will be an ominous day for non-professional drama when the teaching of production succumbs to a method. Its freedom and individuality are among its most praiseworthy features." However, there is this to be considered: There must be sufficient standardization, or better, *concord* in procedure to make possible fair and easily evaluated exchange of credits for such courses between colleges.

Since this brief section on the subject of teaching is quite separate, a kind of epilogue, it seems fitting to sum it up at this point. It postulates that the teacher's equipment consists in:

> a theoretical knowledge of the play and a practical knowledge of the process of its production through adequate training; physical energy, enthusiasm and spiritual strength; an instinct for the stage; vision which keeps work alive and progressive.

It advises the teacher to awaken the creative instincts of the student by developing his power of visualization. This can be accomplished for him through pantomimic exercises, through his observation of another's handling of project, identical with one he has attempted, and through the making of stage models.

Isolated, also, slightly longer, and of more general interest is the section just preceding the last mentioned. It theme is the adaptation and construction of stages. Here are excellent directions for remodeling the old barn, church, or house into a Little Theatre of proper proportions, with sufficient height, width, and depth of stage, and with a seating arrangement which is not a torment to patrons. The plans sketched are excellent. This part of the book is a real contribution, for Irving Pichel's book treats of more pretentious buildings. The article in *The Survey*, January 15, 1927, by Adele Gutman Nathan, "A Home for Cinderella," might profitably be read in this connection, especially by those interested in Settlement Playhouses.

Just as the last and next to the last chapters form an epilogue to the central theme, so also the first, second, and third serve as prologue. A rapid historical survey of the growth in toleration of the theatre in America from Puritan times to the present with its crop of Experimental Art and Little Theatres, and a list of the non-professional worker's accomplishments on the stage are the outstanding materials of Chapter I, the *Introduction*. The second, *The Division of Labor in Play Production*, shows the necessity for specialization in duties with resultant opportunity for the exercise of varied talents in men of widely differing types, takes cognizance of the teacher as director, and urges, as Barrett H. Clark and others have, better team-work and greater harmony in all the interrelated parts of the production than heretofore has been customary. The third, *Organization*, expresses the belief of Crafton and Royer that a community theatre can be supported better by sustaining memberships and small contributions than by subsidy, and that the business manager's duties must be as fixed as the director's duties must be flex-

ible. Graphic charts, pages thirty-three and thirty-nine, show the relationship of staff units for both Little Theatre and College groups.

The main performance of the book, sandwiched in between Prologue and Epilogue, the part of greatest profit to the learner, is that portion from chapters four to seven dealing with production from the respective standpoints of the director, the art director,the actor, and the play itself. A very neat arrangement of facts is made possible by these divisions; there is consequently less discursiveness and repetition than in many of the treatises covering similar ground. Each specialist, too, is able to find easily the subject of his immediate interest. One familiar with the field will enjoy running through these pages for the practical suggestions to be found in them. For the authors have read widely; thriftily they have picked up hints from many remote sources as well as from their own experience. To the novice the volume should be of great service. For him has been synthesized a mass of material which he could not otherwise obtain without a great amount of study.

The beginner, moreover, will find general principles discussed with just enough specific examples to make them clear; he will be guided deftly between conservative and progressive standards, so that he will avoid fads but will always look with unprejudiced eyes at a new experiment achieving widely acknowledged results in spite of dark prophesyings. The clear pen and ink drawings will be a real aid to him in building flats, especially in fitting the joints; in converting a single costume into the characteristic mode of four distinct periods; in studying stage balance; in manipulating curtains to make them look like forests, or what not; in working out shadows in make-up.

What the student will miss are such attractive photographic reproductions of artistic settings as are to be found in the works of Cheney, Clark, Wise, Moderwell, Andrews and Weirick, Stratton, and Pichel. If he has access to the various theatre magazines this will not be a handicap. But the absence of a bibliography is a more serious defect. Though a few worth-while names are mentioned in the body of the text, they are insufficient even for a beginner. Compare, for example, the forty-six page list of C. M. Wise and the fifty-nine page section of B. H. Clark. Perhaps a later edition of

The Process of Play Production will add at least one of these desirable features.

That the book without embellishments holds the attention and pleases speaks well for its quality. It is thorough, sound, and sure without being dogmatic. The style is clear, unaffected, compact, readable, sometimes showing individuality and charm. In short, it is a right-minded, sensible presentation of the subject; it speaks to the reader sometimes with friendly voice, frequently in tone admonitory, but always frankly. It is a book one would unhesitatingly put into the hands of any group of young men and women studying dramatic production and acting.

ELIZABETH LEE BUCKINGHAM, *Stanford University*

Dramatics for School and Community. By C. M. WISE, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1927, pp. 147. $3.

One third of this volume is devoted to bibliographies. Collections of one-act plays, Biblical plays, and longer plays, a short bibliography of general books on the theatre, and an alphabetical list of authors with their plays are listed. The information accompanying the titles of plays is too meagre to serve its purpose as an aid in selection. The bibliographies are frankly not exhaustive and admit occasional error, but will prove useful supplement to other lists and perhaps the most usable part of the book.

The remaining eighty pages of text introduce the reader to the subjects of the little theatre movement, the director, innovations, lighting, settings, costume, the choice of a play, original plays, pageants and masques, problems of presenting plays, make-up, and the dramatic method of teaching. The treatment of so many phases of the subject of dramatic production in so short a space forces the author to a most general discussion. Readers who are searching for new information and suggestion will find the book disappointing.

FREDRICA V. SHATTUCK, *Iowa State College*

Problems of the Actor. By LOUIS CALVERT, Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1918.

Clayton Hamilton is probably right when he says that "acting is the one art whose fundamental principles are rarely, if ever, appreciated by the layman." We do not look to Ibsen and Shaw for

the canons of playwriting, but are quite content to have William Archer and George Pierce Baker expound the processes. Nevertheless we do expect advice on acting to come from an actor, and when an actor of distinction consents to inform us we are prepared to listen and to be enlightened. Louis Calvert is an actor of distinction, well known to theatre-goers on both sides of the Atlantic. His book, furthermore, is both readable and enlightening.

Calvert distinguishes between the *art* of acting and the *craft* of acting, wisely admitting that "we may analyze the technique or the craft of the actor, but his art is above our analysis." The most stimulating part of the book, however, is his defense of the art, an excellent antidote to the devastating humors of Gordon Craig.

There is no question that Calvert has high ideals about his profession. He firmly believes that acting may be an art, and his excellent illustrations of what Joseph Jefferson could do with so rickety a vehicle as *Rip Van Winkle* and David Warfield's amazing interpretation of such an obvious fake as the *Music Master* lead the reader to believe that acting may be, and in fact often is, an imaginative and creative art.

In his discussion of the technique of acting, where we would naturally expect the most valuable advice, Calvert is not so successful. His admonitions are mostly general, such obvious commonplaces as the value of training in stock companies, long and careful work with the voice, intelligent conception of the play as a whole, feeling the part, restraint and economy. His only specific principle as to the voice, for example, is—"If we take care of the consonants the vowels will take care of themselves"—probably the worst advice a young actor could receive. His treatment of characterization, "getting inside one's part," is better, and proves most helpful to both the teacher and student of acting. His lively analysis of Shylock as "Stingy Smith, the tightest man in town," and "Bassanio Brown" will hardly bear the closest scrutiny, but it is useful, and it is always eagerly lapped up by the young Shakespearean. His chapter on the "Art of Doing Nothing" is first-rate and should be studied by every class in Play Production.

For the most part Calvert's remarks on the "five-finger exercises" of the craft are too vague, in no ways comparable to the thorough-going treatment in Constance Smedley's books on Action

and Speech in the *Greenleaf Theatre Elements* or to Halliam Bosworth's *Technique in Dramatic Art.* Calvert neglects the tricks of the trade.

On the other hand, Calvert's illustrations, taken from standard dramas and from the traditionally famous actors, are much more valuable than those in either Bosworth's or Miss Smedley's books. Calvert has made a worthy attempt to set forth the fundamental principles of his art. Furthermore he has a vigorous, entertaining style. His book is good reading for the layman; it is valuable material for the student of drama and theatre.

MARVIN HERRICK, *University of Illinois*

An Autobiography of Abraham Lincoln. BY NATHANIEL WRIGHT STEPHENSON. Indianapolis, The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1926, pp. 501.

Another book on Lincoln, but probably the most unique and valuable of the recent works which have been appearing on this great statesman. This book is, as Mr. Stephenson expresses it, an "attempt to show Lincoln's development through a mosaic of his literary remains." It is a collection of the personal portions of his letters, speeches, and conversations, arranged so as to relate Lincoln's life in his own words. A scheme has been followed wherein the material is presented in chronological order, with running comments which give sufficient biographical information to bind together as well as to clarify the quotations.

There are many commendable features about Mr. Stephenson's labor. At once the reader is impressed with the comprehensiveness of the work. Included in one volume are excerpts and complete quotations of practically all of Lincoln's speeches, letters, and conversations. The diversity of the matter, as well as its skillful arrangement, holds the reader's attention throughout. The book is also interesting because of the pertinent selection of material. Only those portions of Lincoln's long speeches, for instance, which bear directly on the topics presented in the biographical interpolations, are given. Occasionally, one runs on to some new discovery, e. g., Lincoln's letter to Salmon P. Chase on whether or not "Congress has Constitutional authority to enact a fugitive slave law." (Page 182.) But the most distinct feature of the work is the compilation

into one readable volume, from many obscure sources, of significant statements uttered by Lincoln. From about thirty-five works, many of which are out of print or not easily accessible, Mr. Stephenson has gathered substance which reveals the Great Emancipator. Much of what is presented would never come to the attention of the average reader were it not gathered into some such form as the *Autobiography*. This feature constitutes Mr. Stephenson's real contribution to the works on Abraham Lincoln.

For those interested in Lincoln primarily as a speaker, the *Autobiography* does not meet expectations. The main reason is that only small portions of Lincoln's long speeches are given. The short excerpts, for instance, from the House-Divided-Against-Itself Speech, from the debates with Douglas, from the Cooper Institute Address, and from the First Inaugural are not sufficient for a rhetorical study. Besides, there is practically nothing in Lincoln's speeches, letters, or conversations about his manner of speaking, methods of preparation, or attitude towards audiences. Only occasionally does one find something which throws light on such matters, as, for instance, in the letter to Herndon, (quoted on page 66). Writing of his first speech in the House of Representatives, January 5, 1848, Lincoln stated: "I find speaking *here* and *elsewhere* about the same thing. I was about as badly scared, and no worse, as I am when I speak in court."

But the collection is a good source book, and one which stimulates further reading of Lincoln's life and work.

MARVIN G. BAUER, *Iowa State College*

OLD BOOKS

[This department will discuss volumes of interest to students and collectors of old books in our field. Contributions and suggestions should be sent to Hoyt H. Hudson, Princeton University.]

Lecture on the Analysis of Vocal Inflections. By EBENEZER PORTER, D. D. Andover, 1824.

An Analysis of the Principles of Rhetorical Delivery. By EBENEZER PORTER, D. D. Andover, 1827.

Lectures on Eloquence and Style. By EBENEZER PORTER, D. D. Revised for publication by Rev. Lyman Matthews. Andover, 1836.

Ebenezer Porter was one of those mighty, one might almost say massive, scholar-preachers whose names make up the long and creditable honor-roll of New England Congregationalism. He was a Dartmouth man, of the class of 1792, and remained with his *alma mater* three years after being graduated, to take the degree of M. A. Then he preached in various Congregational pulpits until 1812, when he was called to Andover Theological Seminary as Professor of Sacred Rhetoric. This title he held for twenty years, adding to it, in 1827, that of President of the Seminary. He died in 1834, after having refused the presidencies of most of the colleges in New England.

The first two titles listed above are set down for purposes of record and in the hope that some reader may be more fortunate in finding them than was the present reviewer, who must confine his remarks to the *Lectures on Eloquence and Style.* At the very beginning of this book we learn that:

> The Statutes of this Seminary require that in the department of Sacred Rhetoric, a competent number of Lectures shall be delivered, "On the importance of oratory; on the invention and disposition of topics; on the several parts of a regular discourse; on elegance, composition and dignity of style; on pronunciation; on the proper management of the voice

and correct gesture; [These are but our old friends *inventio, dispositio, elocutio, and pronuntiatio;* and the "lost canon" of memoria is not yet lost, either, as it can be found in a few clauses below.] on the immense importance of a natural manner; on the rules to be observed in composing a sermon, and on the adaptation of the principles and precepts of ancient Rhetoric, to this modern species of oration; on the qualities in the speaker, in his style, and in his delivery, necessary to a finished pulpit orator; on the methods of strengthening the memory, and of improving in sacred eloquence; on the character and style of the most ancient Divines, and the best models of imitation, their respective beauties and excellencies in thought and expression; and above all, on the transcendent simplicity, beauty, and sublimity of the sacred writings.

Be it said at once that this formidable program does not in the least daunt President Porter. He knows what Professors of Sacred Rhetoric are for. He makes a grouping of the numerous subjects under five headings and proceeds to lecture; although one must not look to find all his lectures upon all the five headings in this one book.

Even in *Lectures on Eloquence and Style* President Porter's interest in the scientific aspects of his subject emerges, and constitutes for a modern reader perhaps the most notable aspect of his work. In the eighth lecture on eloquence he describes the organs of speech in considerable detail, and urges that his students should learn, by careful observation of their own speech agents, the accurate production of the sounds of speech. After writing out his remarks upon this subject, the author submitted the lecture to "a distinguished member of the medical profession . . . requesting his opinion on the following points: 1. The *correctness* of the Anatomical and *Physiological* statements. 2. The expediency of such remarks from him to Theological students." This consulting physician endorsed President Porter's scientific descriptions, and adjudged that "the expediency of such remarks to Theological students would seem to depend entirely upon the question, whether they can fully understand them." He suggested that in two lectures the vocal organs might be "demonstrated anatomically," presumably with the aid of specimens, with good effect for young men who were to enter the ministry.

Under the topic of "directions for strengthening the voice," Dr. Porter's own advice is fully as scientific and perhaps better expressed than that which he quotes from "the philosophical poet, Dr. Armstrong."

> Read *aloud*, resounding Homer's strain,
> And wield the thunder of Demosthenes.
> The chest, so exercised, improves in strength,
> And quick vibrations through the bowels drive
> The restless blood.

Our author is particularly interested in the problem of "clergymen's sore throat," and gives several case histories, including his own. He mentions, without naming it, a book by an English physician, published in 1829, which "professes to exhibit a definite plan for removing that particular affection of the throat to which clergymen and other public speakers are liable." He also mentions, and quotes from, "an able prize dissertation on *hemoptysis*, by John Ware, M. D."

President Porter's alert mind sees the faults in church architecture, especially in the matter of high pulpits, which add to the difficulties of the preacher. He also lists as an abuse of the vocal powers of such a speaker the location of church buildings upon noisy streets. "It were easy to imagine, without any experience," he writes, "that the trampling of horses, and the rumbling of iron bound wheels, on a naked pavement, under the very windows of a church, in time of public worship, must be a great annoyance to a religious assembly. . . . The stunning noise of the streets compels the speaker to put forth all the powers of his voice; while unavoidably one-half of his sermon is lost to the majority of his hearers. If the number of ministers could be reckoned up, whose lives have been made a sacrifice to the injudicious locations and structure of churches, it would be an appalling catalogue."

Some readers might find most interesting the lecture upon "Obstacles to the cultivation of Eloquence" and "Characteristics of our age and country favorable to it;" especially in view of the period, about 1830, when these remarks were made. Of established American orators, President Porter recognizes Alexander Hamilton as pre-eminent, with Fisher Ames as a close rival. Patrick Henry he only mentions. His estimate of Hamilton might well stimulate a little more active study of that worthy as a speaker; we usually overlook him in making our lists of the great American orators. Porter says of Hamilton that "in respect to versatility and compass of intellect, united with an elegant and powerful elocution, he is to be classed with the very first order of men." The

half of one lecture devoted to "Americanisms" has been overlooked by Krapp and other students of this subject. Here President Porter notes that a number of words and usages to which an American origin had been assigned were really of long-standing English or Scottish use. It may be interesting to know that the use of "profanity" (that is, the word) instead of "profaneness" was at Porter's time unauthorized; and that "organize," "disorganize," "demoralize," and their derivatives were words of American origin which had "within a few years struggled into good use in England."

The other rhetorical works of President Porter should prove of equal value with these lectures on eloquence and style. His outstanding characteristics are an alert scientific approach to his subject and a fair knowledge of the tradition of it, combined with the ability to make practical applications at every point. He deserves a little more attention than he appears to have received.

Note: Porter makes considerable use of Wright's *Philosophy of Elocution*. Does any reader know this book?

H. H. H., *University of Pittsburgh*

IN THE PERIODICALS

[Material for this department should be sent to A. Craig Baird, University of Iowa. Short reviews of important articles, notices of new publications of interest to our readers, lists of articles or single items of possible interest will be welcomed.]

BECHER, EDMOND T. *Shall the Audience Decide?* English Journal XVI, No. 3, pp. 203-212. March, 1927.

The article, written, not from the angle of an educator in speech training, but from that of the debater himself, "from an actual victim (or beneficiary) of the present debate system," defends emphatically the audience vote in debate. The audience decision, in this case, is composed of a vote before and another after the discussion, to determine to what extent the audience has been swayed by the speakers. This double vote is defended on four grounds: (1) The audience vote on the merits of the question is much more valuable as training for the debater than is the formal vote on the merits of the debate. (2) "The audience decision is a more adequate safeguard against the possibility of objectionable prejudice and bias creeping into the measuring process." (3) Such decisions would stimulate greater interest in debate. (4) The audience decision is to be preferred to the decisionless-debate plan.

The author argues his first point by assuming that the exclusive end of debate is to "serve in the pursuit of truth," an assumption against which many speech educators and many contestants have protested. The familiar argument is advanced that, under the expert-judge system, speakers ignore the audience and merely "act" for the critic. College debaters, it is contended, need to speak to audiences because later experiences will be mainly with the crowd. The usual reply, which this article should have disposed of, is that superior debating for a judge's vote necessitates vigorous audience-contact; and that in many cases postgraduate audiences

consist of court-room judges, corporation executives, and other types not approached from a platform.

The author argues that prejudice is shown in the selection of judges, that these officials have bias on the question, and that the unfairness or prejudice on the part of an audience may be minimized by having home teams debate before neutral audiences and by similar devices. "It is certain that the probability of error and prejudice creeping in and swinging a decision one way or another is mathematically much greater in a group of three judges than in a group of three hundred, for example." This statement of the law of averages evidently assumes that a choice in methods of judging must be made between a few expert judges voting on the merits of the debate and a large number of audience—judges voting on the merits of the question. It would of course be possible for the larger group to vote on the merits of the debate and so make "the vote a much more accurate measure of the true outcome of the debate."

The article agrees that competition is still necessary in school and college debating and assumes that the process by which the audience reaction is measured is a fairly accurate gauge for determining victory or defeat. It is highly debatable whether a satisfactory system of audience vote before-and-after-the-contest has been worked out.

In view of the customary charge of superficiality in the preparation and presentation brought against debaters who aim merely at audience approval, the answer to the question, "Shall audiences decide?" should include discussion of this major objection to cutting loose entirely from the critic judge.

A. C. B.

SCOTFORD, JOHN R. *A New Approach to the Teaching of Homiletics.* The Journal of Religion, Vol. VII, No. 1, pp. 72-75. January, 1927.

The article indicts homiletic instruction as usually given in the seminaries. The instruction has "commonly centered about sermon-building. The student has been trained to construct logical outlines and to write lucid English . . . In some instances voice-training has been available for those who desired it . . . Such train-

ing has commonly produced sermonizers rather than preachers." The remedy proposed is that of training the personality of the preacher. If the personality of the preacher is developed, the sermons will "take care of themselves." The primary duty of the theological seminary "is to secure the release of the personality of the student." This "release" is to be brought about by the homiletics instructor who will carefully analyze each student and bring out the individuality. "The class would work together on the problem of getting rid of those inhibitions and mental conflicts which stand between the heart of the minister and the mind of the people. The aim would be to lead each man in his own way to the effective release of his personality." Just what is this "personality" is somewhat vague.

The sacerdotal doctrine here urged sounds like an "old" rather than a "new approach." We should hope that any "new approach" would emphasize analysis of an audience and attention to effective communication.

A. C. B.

DAVIDSON, H. CARTER. *Public Speaking—A Liberal Education.* Education, March, 1927.

The plea is for training in public speaking. First, an hour of speaking provides good physical exercise, in fact "as much beneficial exercise, as does an average eighteen-hole round of golf or three sets of tennis." Second, "Mentally, training brings ease on the platform." If the former statement made you skeptical of the author's physiology, the latter will leave you perplexed about his psychology. There is little to commend or to condemn in the composition, except that its lack of content and depth will serve to confirm the view, prevalent in many academic circles, that this thing, called public speaking, should keep its place. However, public speaking—according to the author—"is the basis and essence of a liberal education."

WM. E. YOUNG, *University of Iowa*

SCHWESINGER, GLADYS C. *Slang as an Indication of Character.* Journal of Applied Psychology, X:245-263. June, 1926.

Several tests were given, based upon knowledge and use of

slang, in an effort to determine whether by such a method delinquents among adolescents could be picked out from non-delinquents. "We tend to associate bad language with delinquent behavior, but is one an index of the other?" "The tests did not pick out the school incorrigibles from those who were not rated as incorrigible."

G. W. G.

NEWS AND NOTES

[Items intended for this department,—play programs, announcements of new courses, changes in positions, programs of state and sectional meetings, and personals,—should be sent directly to Miss Lousene Rousseau, University of Wisconsin, Madison. Normal School items will be received by Carroll P. Lahman, Western State Normal School, Kalamazoo, Michigan.]

The Eastern Public Speaking Conference met at Hunter College on April 22nd and 23rd. The following program was presented: Address of Welcome, Miss Henrietta Prentiss, Hunter College; The Analysis of Subject-Matter in Persuasion, John Morris, New York University; Rhythm in the Reading of Prose and Poetry, Carey Jacobs, Smith College; A Dramatic Approach to Public Speaking, Elizabeth Vera-Loeb, Hunter College; The Perennial Sophist, Charles Sears Baldwin, Columbia University; How Do You Know a Speech is a Good Speech? James A. Winans, Dartmouth College; The Standardization of Phonetics, Richard C. Borden, New York University; Recent Discussions of Standardized Pronunciation, C. K. Thomas, University of Pittsburgh; Speech and the Speech Arts in the Light of Individual Psychology, W. B. Wolfe, M. D.; Modern Theories of Voice Production, S. R. Muckey, M. D.; The American Academy of Speech Correction, Sarah Stinchfield, Mt. Holyoke College. The officers for the following year are, President, Elizabeth Avery, Smith College; Vice-President, James A. Winans, Dartmouth College; Secretary-Treasurer, Mrs. Harvey, Hunter College; Member-at-Large, G. Rowland Collins, New York University.

Oregon Agricultural College, Corvallis, was host, April 7 and 8, to the Pacific Forensic League. Aside from the usual business sessions, the annual Extempore Speaking Contest was held at Corvallis, and the next evening the annual Oratorical Contest was held at

Wilamette University, Salem. The new officers elected for 1927-28 are President, C. B. Mitchell, Oregon Agricultural College; Vice-President, Allen Nichols, University of Southern California, Secretary and Treasurer, C. J. Beam, Whitman College.

A Public Speaking and Dramatics Conference was held as part of the annual meeting of the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club at Ann Arbor, April 29. The chairman was H. L. Ewbank of Albion College, and the Vice-Chairman, F. B. McKay of Michigan State Normal College. The program was as follows:

The High School and Speech Correction, Harry Wood, U. of Michigan; Debate and Scholarship, Ruth Huston Whipple, Plymouth High School; Aims and Content of a Beginning Course, Round Table; Some Elements of Acting, David Owen, U. of Michigan.

The Ohio Association of Teachers of Speech, of which C. R. Layton of Muskingum is president and Leon McCarty of Cincinnati is secretary, met April 8, when the following program was presented:

The Place of a Course in Interpretation in the College Curriculum, D. G. Lean, Wooster College; Organizing the Play Production Course, R. C. Hunter, Wesleyan; What Has the College a Right to Expect from the Department of Speech, W. H. Cooper, Ohio University; Argumentation and Debate, C. R. Wiley, Ohio State.

Many members of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION will be interested in the annual Drama League Convention, which is to be held at Tacoma, Washington, June 21 to July 2, and which will be followed by the annual summer meeting of the National Educational Association, which begins just a day later in Seattle, and where a Speech program will likewise be presented. The Drama League programs will cover Little Theatre work, drama in education, children's theatres, drama in high schools and colleges, religious drama, consorship, etc. Many delightful side-trips and several special performances of interesting plays are planned, of which an evening of *Commedia Dell Arte*, conducted by Alexander Dean, Director of the

North Shore Theatre Guild, and *Paola and Francesca* have been announced.

The American Academy of Speech Correction has already gained recognition by educational authorities. At the request of the United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. Robert West, president of the Academy, appointed Mrs. Mabel V. Lacy to represent that organization at the Pan-Pacific Educational Conference held very recently in Honolulu. At the conference, all the American educational institutions near the Pacific Ocean were represented. Mrs. Lacy is principal of the Territorial School for the Deaf, Blind, and Defective at Honolulu. The Eastern Public Speaking Conference was attended by Dr. Sarah Stinchfield, Mt. Holyoke College, as representative of the Academy.

An interesting development in the field of Speech Correction in Wisconsin is the increasing number of free clinics held in outside towns by the staff of the Speech Department of the University. Very recently Dr. West and his assistants held such a clinic in Beloit, where the college psychology department and the Speech Correction department of the public schools cöoperated, all cases being brought to the clinic through the public schools. Dr. West has offered his services to any college wishing such clinics, provided cases can be secured through either the public schools or county nurses. A similar clinic was recently held at Milwaukee State Teachers' College. Arrangements are being made for another, to be sponsored by the Oshkosh State Teachers' College.

Announcement is made by the American Psychological Association of the publication of a new journal, *Psychological Abstracts*, of which the first number appeared in January, 1927. The magazine is edited by Professor Walter S. Hunter of Clark University, assisted by a staff of distinguished foreign scholars. As the name suggests, it will be devoted to non-critical abstracts of articles and books on psychological and related subjects.

Under the direction of the Department of Speech, Western State Normal of Michigan has this year organized the Extempore

Speaking Association of Michigan High School, with a membership of 35 schools in more than twenty counties. Topics are chosen from outstanding current events discussed in the Literary Digest and Review of Reviews, but no definite list of set topics is sent out in advance. After drawing topics, contestants have one hour in which to prepare speeches. District contests were held April 22, and the final state contest, in which those taking first and second places in the district contests participated, was held at Kalamazoo May 7.

The fifty-third annual contest of the Interstate Oratorical Association, which is, by the way, the oldest oratorical association in the United States, and claims one hundred twenty-five colleges as members, was held at the North Shore Hotel, Evanston, April 30. Representatives from Albion College, Michigan, Wooster College, Ohio, Simpson College, Iowa, Carleton College, Minnesota, Park College, Missouri, and Wabash College, Indiana, participated. Judges were Professors O'Neill and Weaver of the University of Wisconsin, C. H. Woolbert of the University of Iowa, Professors Dennis, Lardner, and Hardy of the Northwestern University School of Speech, and Professor Nelson of the University of Chicago.

The annual contest of the Northern Oratorical League was held April 29 at the University of Iowa.

Western State Normal of Michigan gave twenty men the opportunity to represent the college in intercollegiate debates this year. Albion College used fourteen different speakers on the men's varsity teams. Michigan colleges are pursuing the policy of giving as many men as possible the experience of speaking in intercollegiate competition.

Over KWSC, the broadcasting station of Washington State College, occurred a debate between two men's teams of the college on the Chinese question. On May 16, two weeks later, women debaters of the college discussed the question of movie censorship. Decisions in both debates were given by the radio audience of listeners scattered over a wide range of territory.

DRAMATICS

The Cornell Dramatic Club has had an extremely heavy and varied program during the past season. The programs included eight major productions and forty one-act plays, playing a total of fifty-one evenings during the college year. Important productions were: the first American performance of Pirandello's *Right You Are (If You Think So)*, by special arrangement with the Theatre Guild of New York; a group of Christmas cycles from the Chester Mystery Plays; a faithful eighteenth century production of Sheridan's *The Critic* in modern dress and modern scenery; a revival of Cohan's *Seven Keys to Baldpate;* a children's play, *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs;* a special Shakespearean production, *A Midsummer Night's Dream;* and an expressionistic jazz-morality by A. M. Drummond, *Traffic Signals.* One-acts produced included Eugene O'Neill's *Where the Cross is Made;* Maurice Baring's *The Drawback* and *Calpurnia's Dinner Party;* Dunsany's *Fame and the Poet, A Night at an Inn, The Golden Doom, The Gods of the Mountain, The Glittering Gate;* Shaw's *How He Lied to Her Husband;* Octave Mirabeau's *Scruples;* Kenneth Sawyer Goodman's *The Green Scarf* and *A Game of Chess;* Jacinto Benavente's *The Magic of an Hour* and *No Smoking;* Yeat's *Pot O' Broth,* Walker's *The Very Naked Boy,* Edna Ferber's *The Eldest,* Tchekoff's *Marriage Proposal,* George Ade's *Speaking to Father,* John Reed's *Freedom,* Carl Glick's *It Isn't Done,* William Prosser's *Free Speech,* Lennox Robinson's *Crabbed Youth and Age,* Alice Gerstenberg's *Ever Young,* William Dean Howells' *The Mouse Trap,* John V. A. Weaver's *So That's That,* Barrie's *Shall We Join the Ladies?* Edna St. Vincent Millay's *Two Slatterns and a King,* Stephen Leacock's *Behind the Beyond,* and *'Op-O-Me-Thumb,* by Fenn and Pryce.

In addition to the foregoing program, the Club's Producing Staff staged the annual Dance Festival, the annual Kermis Plays of the College of Agriculture, and several other events of a theatrical nature, and sponsored Thomas Wilfred's *Clavilux* recital.

The directing staff for the year was composed of A. M. Drummond, Director, Richard Dunham, Bernard Lenrow, Judson Genung, Evelyn Casey, Constance Brown, Frances Eagan, and Walter Stainton.

A group of Cornell graduates, former members of the Cornell Dramatic Club, were organized under the auspices of the Cornell Women's Club of New York City, to present dramatic performances at the Hecksher Theatre in New York during April.

The 1926-27 dramatic season at the State College at Pullman, Washington, has been a very busy one. During the year the National Collegiate Players presented *Three Wise Fools* under the direction of Maynard Lee Daggy; the dramatic classes presented *Rollo's Wild Oat* and *The Fool,* directed by Hamilton Cummins; Play Production classes offered *Hell Bent Fer Heaven* and *One of the Family,* under Professor Daggy's direction. Lechmere Morrall's comedy *Ann* was given at the Inland Empire Educational Association at Spokane, April 7, before an audience of 1500 teachers, under the joint direction of Mr. Daggy and Miss Ida Lou Anderson. *The Show Off* will be the Commencement play.

Play tournaments for school groups are being staged with greater frequency each year. One of the first such contests to be established was that sponsored by the School of Speech of Northwestern University, where the prize is a cash award of two hundred fifty dollars and the Cumnock Cup. The first contest was held two years ago, at the time of the December Convention of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH. The second was held in April of this year, at which time the institutions represented were University of West Virginia, Morgantown; Berea College, Kentucky; Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan; Evansville College, Indiana; Albion College, Michigan; and State Teachers' Colleges from Bowling Green, Ohio, Kalamazoo, Michigan, Valley City, North Dakota and Macomb, Illinois.

The Intercollegiate Dramatic Association of Pennsylvania sponsored a similar event March 4 and 5, which was held in the auditorium of Drexel Institute, Philadelphia. The competing colleges were Penn State, Bucknell, Haverford, Irving, Juniata, Villanova, and Drexel.

The second annual drama contest for secondary schools held under the management of the Washington Square College Players

attracted seven neighboring high schools, and the following plays were presented: Booth Tarkington's *Bimbo the Pirate;* Alice Gerstenberg's *The Potboiler; Lonesome-Like* and *Maypole Morning,* by Harold Brighouse; Dunsany's *Night at an Inn;* Barnum's *Aunt From California,* and scenes from *The Taming of the Shrew.*

Early in March a dramatic contest was sponsored by the Scarborough School, New York, for which the prize cup was offered by the Beechwood Players, a local Little Theatre Group. The judges of the contest were Barrett Clark, Winifred Lenihan, Knowles Entuken, Walter Hartwig, Henry Stillman and S. M. Tucker.

The North Carolina Playmakers, of the University of North Carolina, are taking their plays—mostly those portraying North Carolina life—to the people of their own and neighboring states. A big blue bus, labelled "The Playmakers' Special," loads scenery, properties, and lighting equipment on top and actors and business staff inside, and goes on tour. Their 1927 trip took them from Lynchburg, West Virginia, to Atlanta, Georgia.

An unusually interesting dramatic offering was that presented recently by the Homewood Playshop of Johns Hopkins University. *The Round Trip,* by John Van Bruten, noted as the author of *Young Woodley,* was given its American premiere, with the author himself playing the leading role.

The West Liberty State Normal School of West Virginia has formed a dramatic organization which includes students, alumnae, faculty members and citizens of the community. Productions this year have been: Maude Futon's *The Brat,* O'Neill's *In The Zone,* Lady Gregory's *Spreading The News,* Gasworthy's *The First and the Last,* Tchekoff's *The Boor,* Rostand's *Romancers,* and Lulu Vollner's *Sun Up.*

Major productions at the University of Iowa this year have included *Hell Bent For Heaven, Hamlet,* Milne's *Romantic Age,* Barry's *The Youngest, So This is London,* and *Craig's Wife.*

The Shaman Players of Tucson, Arizona, have just completed

a dramatic program which included *Much Ado About Nothing*, Ibsen's *Ghosts*, Craven's *The First Year*, and two original one-acts of early life in Arizona. Miss Marguerite Morrow, formerly of the Speech staff at the University of Iowa, is the director of the club.

The Marionettes, dramatic club of Hood College, Maryland, have produced recently Flavin's *Children of the Moon*, Moliere's *Les Precieuses Ridicules*, Yeats' *Land of Heart's Desire*, and Barrie's *Twelve Pound Look* and *The Old Lady Shows her Medals*.

The dramatic program at the University of Nebraska this year has included *The Music Master* and *Craig's Wife*, presented by the University Players, and *The Dream Pirate*, an original musical comedy, by the Kosmet Club.

Northwestern Missouri State Teachers' College at Maryville recently presented two Missouri folk-plays, *The Clavers'll Git Ye*, and *The One Who Dreams*, by Townsend Godsey, a former student.

Under the direction of Joseph Turner, Hollins College, Virginia, has produced Barry's *You and I*, McCarthy's *If I Were King*, Shaw's *Candida*, Crothers' *Mary the Third*, and Barrie's *Quality Street*.

At Stout Institute, Menominee, Wisconsin, Miss Nellie Bass this spring directed the production of *The Whole Town's Talking*, by John Emerson and Anita Loos, and Lewis Beach's *The Goose Hangs High*.

The Drama Teachers' Association of California held its seventh annual conference early in April, at Berkeley, under the auspices of the California State Board of Education. The programs, which continued for three days, covered all phases of school dramatics, voice training, and the emotional problems of the school-age child. The Drama Teachers' Summer School of the Theatre will hold its fifth annual session at the Berkeley High School, July 2 to July 30.

PERSONALS

Professor James Milton O'Neill has accepted the chairmanship of a new Department of Speech at the University of Michigan, which will supersede the Department of Public Speaking from the chairmanship of which Professor T. C. Trueblood recently retired. Professor O'Neill has been chairman of the Department of Speech at the University of Wisconsin for fourteen years. He will be succeeded by Dr. A. T. Weaver, President of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH.

The Summer School Staff in Public Speaking at Cornell will include, in addition to members of the regular staff, Professor J. A. Winans of Dartmouth College, who will conduct round-table conference and lectures during the fourth and fifth weeks of the session; Dr. Stainton and Professor M. T. Herrick of the University of Illinois, for dramatic production. The Summer Theatre will be under the direction of A. M. Drummond, assisted by Arthur Woehl, Richard Dunham, and the staff of the University Theatre.

Several announcements of changes in the Pacific Northwest colleges for the summer have been made. Maynard Lee Daggy, of State College, at Pullman, Washington, will spend the summer resting and lecturing in California. Miss Ida Lou Anderson will be in charge of courses at Pullman during his absence. The University of Washington is offering special courses under the direction of Professor Lovejoy, and Oregon Agricultural College is making a special feature of Speech courses this summer.

Additional instructors in the Department of Speech for the approaching Summer Session at the University of Wisconsin will be Mrs. Berry of Rockford College, Miss Marguerite Dollard of Newark, New Jersey, and William J. Farma, of the College of the City of New York, president of National Collegiate Players.

Professor John P. Ryan, of Grinnell College, Iowa, will teach this summer at the University of West Virginia, Morgantown.

Mr. Bryng Bryngelson, who is a member of the staff at the

University of Wisconsin, will teach at the University of Minnesota this summer.

P. H. Scott, for the past five years in charge of the Public Speaking division at Purdue, will go to the College of the City of Detroit this fall to establish a Department of Speech there. He reports a liberal allowance for laboratory and library facilities.

Sawyer Falk, director of dramatics at Hillsdale College, Michigan, has resigned his position to join the staff at Syracuse University, where he will direct dramatic activities.

Ralph Dennis, Dean of the School of Speech of Northwestern University, will sail for Europe in June to bring back his wife and son, who have spent the past two years in Switzerland. The many friends of Professor Dennis will be glad to learn that Mrs. Dennis has almost completely recovered her health.

E. P. Trueblood of Earlham College had a leave of absence from December to April, spending that time in Florida with his brother T. C. Trueblood. During his absence his classes were conducted by Paul Lichtenfeln, a graduate of Earlham.

Dr. Robert West, of the staff at the University of Wisconsin, was recently elected a member of the Dane County Board of Supervisors which has charge of all poor relief, county asylums, mothers' pensions, county teachers, etc.

Mr. E. C. Buehler of the University of Kansas, Lawrence, was married during the holidays to Miss Lorraine Bates, who was at the time a graduate student in Speech at Northwestern University. They are now at home at 1530 Tennessee Street, Lawrence, Kansas.

Dr. Lee Travis of the University of Iowa is now in Europe for study.

Dr. Robert McLean Cumnock, founder of the present School of Speech at Northwestern University, and now 87 years old, will receive an honorary Litt. D. from the University of Southern California in June.

Miss Belle Kennedy, formerly with the Central School of Speech Training in London, and now of the staff of the public schools in Evanston, Illinois, will present a course in Speech Defects and a course in Voice and Diction in the coming summer session of Northwestern University School of Speech.

W. S. Howell of Washington University, St. Louis, is planning to take a leave of absence from that school next year, devoting the year to study at Cornell.

Lew Sarett reached Chicago the middle of April after a ten-weeks lecture course which took him from the Atlantic to the Pacific. His lectures are sponsored by the Redpath Bureau, and the few weeks which he devotes to public work each year are sold out a year in advance. At the present time he is enjoying his sabbatical year, and will return to Northwestern to teach during the second semester of 1927-28.

Mr. C. K. Thomas, who has been teaching at the University of Pittsburgh, will return to Cornell University for the Summer Session and for next year.

Professor Calvin L. Lewis, Chairman of the Department of Public Speaking in Hamilton College, will take his sabbatical year during 1927-28. During his absence Professor Willard Marsh will be in charge.

Among the graduate students at Cornell are Professor Russell H. Wagner, of Iowa State College, who will continue his studies one more year; Howard Bradley, of Dartmouth College, Dorothy Kaucher of the University of Missouri, and W. M. Parrish of the University of Pittsburgh.

Dr. Hoyt H. Hudson, of the University of Pittsburgh, will join the Department of English of Princeton University next fall, as Associate Professor of Public Speaking. He will be succeeded at Pittsburgh by Dr. Marvin Herrick of the University of Illinois.